

Response to 2004 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Land Use and Transportation #1a (Land Use)

(Page 28 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

As the County approaches build out, it is important to review the goals and direction of land use policies as directed in the Comprehensive Plan. EQAC recommends that the County produce an updated version of the State of the Plan, An Evaluation of Comprehensive Plan Activities between 1990-1995 with an Assessment of Impacts through 2010 (originally published in 1996) to reflect current population shifts, build-out, and infill development.

Lead agencies for this response: DPZ

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: None

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Sterling Wheeler

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

The State of the Plan document of 1996 provided information on how the Comprehensive Plan changed between 1990-1995 in terms of development potential (i.e., Plan build-out); an assessment of the degree to which the Comprehensive Plan's goals, objectives and policies had been implemented; and, suggested new actions that should be pursued to improve the implementation of the Comprehensive Plan.

As part of Plan Monitoring activities begun in 2003 staff will address a key element of this recommendation by evaluating Comprehensive Plan amendments adopted between 1995 and 2003. These amendments will be quantified and then analyzed to determine how the Plan's build-out potential has changed. This information will assist staff in updating regional population and employment forecasts and provide useful information to EQAC and others in understanding how future development will be shaped by the recommendations in the Comprehensive Plan. The summary results of the analysis of Plan changes will be available in late 2005 and will incorporate amendments associated with the 2004 North County Area Plans Review (APR). This information should addresses item 1 above.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

After each Plan Review Cycle, the Plan change and Plan buildout information should be summarized and updated to provide current information regarding future development potential in the County.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2006? If so, please explain.

The actions described above are part of the current Plan Review process as recommended by the Planning Commission. There are no budget implications for FY 2006.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

Staff recommended actions (as mentioned above) do not have additional longer-range fiscal implications.

Response to 2004 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Land Use and Transportation #1b (Land Use)

(Page 28 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC recommends that the county continue the process to upgrade or replace the Urban Development Information System (UDIS), which was developed in the 1970s and is still the primary information system for mapping land use. The new system should apply current technology in a manner that will improve the county's ability to evaluate planning and development issues, to better account for Comprehensive plan options, to capture real time plan changes, and to include additional data to plan and manage development and growth, such as:

- i. Existing and Planned Commercial and industrial intensity;
- ii. Existing and Planned Mixed-use types and intensity;
- iii. Vacant and underused lots with redevelopment potential; and
- iv. Environmental data such as impervious surfaces.

Lead agencies for this response: Systems Management for Human Services

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: DIT, DPZ, DTA, DPWES

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Anne Cahill

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

Different agencies are addressing different parts of this recommendation. If future follow-up is desired, EQAC may wish to split this inquiry into multiple inquiries that go directly to the agency responsible for the business function.

- The Department of Systems Management for Human Services summarizes existing land use and planned land use as of January 1 of each year, providing a longitudinal snapshot. The Urban Development Information System (UDIS) is a set of computer programs used to generate these summaries.
- The Department of Tax Administration maintains real estate data that provides parcel-based, real-time, existing land use information. These data are available for use and analysis through the Department of Information Technology's Geographic Information System (GIS).
- As the source of planned land use information, the Department of Planning and Zoning (DPZ) develops and defines planned land use codes. DPZ staff annually enters and updates planned land use information into a data base used by UDIS which reflects the status of a land parcel as of January 1 of each year. Currently, DPZ is developing a GIS digitized version of this information.

Land Use and Transportation #1b

Continued

- The Department of Public Works and Environment Services, Stormwater Planning Division develops impervious surface information.

The Urban Development Information System (UDIS) currently provides annual, point-in-time, summaries of the first three items. Research and discussion has occurred about whether UDIS can be made more flexible in capturing enhanced nonresidential intensities, enhanced mixed-use information and intensities, and Comprehensive Plan options in real time. The ability of UDIS to capture these types of information is not feasible.

Currently, real time summaries of existing land use can be accommodated using the real estate data bases maintained by the Department of Tax Administration and the Department of Information Technology's GIS group. The ability of these data to provide enhanced information, such as mixed use types and intensities, is limited by the specificity of land use codes.

The Department of Planning and Zoning is developing a digital version of the Comprehensive Land Use Plan map, which will provide base planned land use information. DPZ also is developing a framework for creating a real-time, GIS-based planned land use data base; however, no funding is available for implementing this project.

The Stormwater Planning Division (SWPD) in DPWES has developed imperviousness values for subwatersheds with a mean area of approximately 0.7 square miles for the entire county utilizing 1997 planimetric GIS layers. As the planimetric layers are updated by the GIS branch based on 2002 data, they may generate a new imperviousness GIS layer but no timeframe for completing this is currently available. SWPD has also predicted current and future countywide imperviousness values based on the ratio of 1997 imperviousness and number of housing units in 1997 and applying it to the number of housing units at the current time and in the future. They are currently evaluating whether it is possible to use this methodology to predict current and future imperviousness for smaller areas such as sewersheds or subcensus tracts for which housing unit data are available.

The SWPD is also currently developing watershed management plans for approximately 60% of the total county area. For these plans, the 1997 planimetric layers were assumed to reflect current conditions and an ultimate imperviousness value was predicted for subwatersheds based on planned land use for all vacant and underutilized residential parcels. Additionally, a 'build-out' imperviousness value was utilized for all non-residential parcels for ultimate imperviousness predictions.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

Staff concurs with EQAC that the County needs to improve its ability to evaluate planning and development issues, to better account for Comprehensive plan options, to capture real time plan changes, and to include additional data to plan and manage development and growth. However, it is clear that UDIS, a static point-in-time, mainframe computer system, cannot fulfill the role of tracking and linking land information in the manner desired. In addition, the Department of Systems Management for Human Services, that maintains UDIS, has the primary business function to summarize and create housing and population information not track real-time land use. Pieces of the EQAC recommendation are being addressed independently by individual departments which are providing and/or building GIS data bases to contain much of the information desired. The Department of Tax Administration has done the most to advance the goals of EQAC by allowing all county staff to access and use the public assessment data through GIS data bases. If all other business functions involved in creating and tracking land parcel information also make their data available in a similar manner, the County's GIS and relational data base tools may contain the means necessary for providing the desired real-time linking, tracking and summarization capabilities recommended by EQAC.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

A formal stakeholder's team needs to be established to:

1. Determine the feasibility of linking together data and systems currently under development that contain land parcel information;
2. Determine the feasibility of developing new systems to address needs identified by EQAC that are not yet being addressed; and
3. Develop a means to collect, link and manage all data associated with the life cycle of a land parcel that can be widely used by all stakeholders.

The current estimated cost or timing of such an effort had not been determined at the time of this response was prepared. Additionally, a lead agency has not yet been identified to initiate this work.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2006? If so, please explain.

Yes, but impact is not yet known. The Department of Systems Management for Human Services (DSMHS) with the Department of Information Technology (DIT) maintain the current operational capabilities of UDIS. DSMHS, whose primary function is to develop small area housing and population estimates and forecasts to support the County's demographic information needs, will submit a funding proposal as part of the FY 2007 budget to redesign the demographic estimation and forecasting process.

Land Use and Transportation #1b

Continued

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

Ongoing costs are associated with developing, maintaining, and upgrading the data bases and systems mentioned above.

Response to 2004 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Land Use and Transportation #1c

(Page 28 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC recommends that the BOS and the county's Department of Planning and Zoning continue to consider land use AND transportation together when revising the Comprehensive Plan. To start this process the county should develop and collect data that allows analysis of the macro effects of land use and transportation decisions.

These data should support models that integrate congestion, air quality, commuting patterns, and health effects for use in future decisions.

Lead agencies for this response: DPZ (Planning Division)

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: DOT

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Sterling Wheeler

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

The evaluations of proposed Plan amendments do consider land use and transportation impacts; however, the evaluation is on a micro, not a macro level.

Currently, the County's Department of Transportation is beginning a comprehensive review of the County's Transportation Plan, which will evaluate future land use and transportation facilities on the macro level. A key aspect of this review process will be to refine and make operational the County-wide transportation model; the model will be utilized in analyzing the planned transportation system. The County's consultant and staff will evaluate model output and formulate recommended changes to the Transportation Plan. The model also will be available for future County-wide and sub-area transportation analyses as well as evaluating transportation impacts associated with significant proposed Plan amendments. However, additional funding or staffing resources may be required to complete such analyses.

The air quality component of the EQAC recommendation can be considered at a number of levels. As EQAC is aware, air quality planning at the regional level is conducted by the Metropolitan Washington Air Quality Committee, with the technical staff support and evaluations provided by the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (COG). However, this effort is geared toward demonstrating attainment of Federal air quality

requirements and not to evaluating land use and transportation concepts as they relate to air quality. Another effort being undertaken at COG is an evaluation of various regional growth scenarios for their transportation and air quality implications. County staff is participating in this study and tracking it closely for implications to land use planning in Fairfax County.

At the local level, the idea of incorporating air quality modeling analyses into land use decisions would not, in our view, be appropriate for site-specific development or Plan amendment proposals but may have merit for countywide, regional, or subregional planning and transportation studies involving significant alternative scenarios. We feel that air quality considerations of land use decisions (except for those involving significant point sources) need to be considered in a regional context and that an exercise through which emissions of pollutants are estimated for a particular development proposal would be meaningless outside of this context. However, we do feel that it is appropriate to evaluate such proposals from the standpoint of measures that can be taken by developers to reduce vehicle trips and recommend that this be a continuing consideration in the zoning and Plan amendment processes. For countywide, regional, or subregional planning exercises, there may be merit to evaluating the regional emissions levels associated with various development scenarios. We would note that such an analysis was performed in 1989 when several countywide development scenarios were being considered during the Policy Plan development process.

As an example of encouraging smart growth during the past year; staff working with a citizen group and developer formulated recommendations for transit-oriented design and densities adjacent to the Vienna Metro station in the Fairlee area. In this effort, extensive consideration and commitment occurred with regard to Metro access, pedestrian mobility, mixed use development, transportation demand management, and technological enhancements intended to reduce reliance on the automobile and encourage pedestrian activity and Metro use.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

We do concur with the major emphasis of the recommendation, which is to improve the evaluation of transportation impacts during the Plan amendment process by having the capability to understand implications at both the micro and macro levels. This aspect of the recommendation is currently being implemented as indicated above.

With respect to air quality analyses, we recommend that the idea of modeling emissions be considered if and when countywide, regional, or subregional planning studies are initiated. We were not (in the time frame provided for this response) able to conduct research on available models for such an effort, but would envision that efforts similar to that performed in 1989 (using the Mobile4 [now Mobile6] model to estimate mobile source emissions and using population-specific emissions factors to estimate area sources) could be applied given a robust transportation modeling effort. We are not

aware of how specific health effects can be modeled in this manner given the regional nature of ozone pollution.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

Continue the processes that are underway: 1) the evaluation and updating of the County's Transportation Plan, and 2) continue to work with COG on addressing air quality issues. We also recommend that the COG effort to evaluate air quality implications of various land use scenarios continue to be tracked.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2006? If so, please explain.

As noted above, funding was provided for transportation modeling to update the County's Transportation Plan. This effort will extend into FY 2006. Refining and using the transportation model to address issues that are identified through the Transportation Plan review would have budget implications for FY 2006. While the transportation model will be a useful tool for County planners, no funds for conducting additional studies using the model have been budgeted for FY 2006 or subsequent years. However, two such sub-area studies were funded and initiated in FY2005, to be conducted concurrently with the Transportation Plan Update (the Tysons Corner Transportation & Urban Design Study and the Laurel Hill Transportation Analysis and Preliminary Engineering Study). The cost of each study is approximately \$400,000.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

In order to obtain full benefits from the transportation model for analyses and conducting sub-area studies, additional resources of funding or staff are needed. Such ongoing efforts could cost \$200,000 to \$ 400,000 per year in consultant fees or would require several additional technical staff proficient in transportation modeling.

If the Mobile6 air quality model is acquired (even at no cost), conducting air quality analyses during future large area studies will require additional resources.

Response to 2004 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Land Use and Transportation #1d (Land Use)

(Page 1-28 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC recommends that the BOS consider mixed-use principles when locating future public facilities such as libraries and recreation centers, so they are within walking/biking distance of major population centers.

Lead agencies for this response: DPZ

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: DPWES; FCPA

Please identify a lead agency contact person: David Marshall

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

The Public Facilities, Human Services and Parks and Recreation sections of the Policy Plan element of the Comprehensive Plan contain policies and standards encouraging many public uses to be accessible, convenient, and jointly located. These policies and standards support this EQAC recommendation. This Plan guidance provides the framework for determining appropriate public facility locations and is used in the review of new and expanded facility proposals through the County's 2232 Review process. Further, the County's process, principles and related project evaluation criteria used for developing the annual Capital Improvement Program also assist in supporting the EQAC recommendation. Although timing, costs and site availability can sometime limit the ability to select locations that provide optimum pedestrian, mass transit, and bicycle access, accessibility and proximity to households and employment are factors in the site selection process.

The Park Authority supports locating public facilities in close proximity to one another. Currently, Park facilities are located and designed based on a combination of public input, the Parks and Recreation Needs Assessment, and the availability of suitable land. The Parks and Recreation Needs Assessment is the primary tool used by FCPA to identify and address park facility deficiency in the County and is the first step in planning the location of facilities in new or existing parks. Implementation of the Needs Assessment is ongoing through the Capital Improvement Program, Comprehensive Plan amendments, and Long Range Park Planning.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

Staff concurs with the recommendation. Staff will continue to look for opportunities in the planning and development review processes to locate public facilities within mixed use areas so that they are closer to future housing and employment centers.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2005? If so, please explain.

No budget implications.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

No.

Response to 2004 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Land Use and Transportation #2a (Teleworking)

(Page 28 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC commends the Board of Supervisors for actively supporting teleworking among the county staff. We are encouraged that the county is steadily increasing participation toward twenty percent. We urge that the Board continue to aggressively support the program.

Lead agencies for this response: County Executive's Office

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: None

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Catherine Chianese

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

The Fairfax County Board of Supervisors and the County Executive have supported telework for the county workforce since 1996 and have endorsed the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (COG) goal of 20% of the area's eligible workforce teleworking by 2005. Support for telework is one way that the county's leadership is addressing quality of life issues such as traffic congestion and air quality.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

In October 2001, the county recommitted its telework efforts and launched the Telework Expansion Project. The intent of the project is to increase employee participation to reach a goal of 1,000 teleworkers by 2005. Fairfax County government has approximately 5,000 positions that could be considered eligible for telework out of the county's total permanent workforce. One thousand teleworkers represent 20% of the positions considered eligible for telework.

This 20% goal is aggressive given the fact that Fairfax County government is primarily a service oriented organization. While technology and the county's e-government initiatives have resulted in more citizens doing business with the county from remote locations, such as their homes, there are many county employees who are required, everyday, to have face-to-face contact with the public.

Land Use and Transportation #2a

Continued

What progress has the county made in 3 ½ years? Almost every department has teleworkers, the number of teleworkers rose from 138 in December 2001 to over 800 in December of 2004. Job categories are increasingly varied. Sample job titles for teleworkers include analysts of all types, administrative assistants, accountants, programmers, social workers, inspectors, engineers, public safety personnel, recreation and park specialists. Directors and assistant directors telework. The range of jobs widens as more employees discover there are at least eight hours of work they can do from another location – once a week or every other week.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

The 20% goal set by COG is aggressive and achievable for Fairfax County government.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2006? If so, please explain.

The Telework Expansion Program is funded within the department budgets of Information Technology, Human Resources and Public Affairs.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

A continued adequate level of funding for the Telework Expansion Project is anticipated.

Response to 2004 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Land Use and Transportation #2b (Teleworking)

(Pages 28-29 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC recommends that the Board of Supervisors maintain its leadership role in improving the environment through greater use of teleworking by establishing an aggressive program directed at encouraging employers in the county to adopt or expand telework opportunities.

Lead agencies for this response: County Executive's Office

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: None

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Catherine Chianese

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

At a joint press conference held on February 11, 2004, Fairfax County Board Chairman Gerald Connolly, the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (COG) and the Greater Washington Board of Trade announced a new effort to encourage 50,000 more commuters to telework by 2005. This program, which is aimed at large employers and federal agencies, includes customized training programs and free trials at telework centers and marks the first time that public and private organizations in the metro area have come together to promote teleworking.

In October 2000, the first Washington Area Conference on Telework – or WACOT as it is known – was held at the Fairfax County government center. The county sponsored that event together with COG. On Tuesday, October 12, 2004 a very successful Washington Area Conference on Telework (WACOT) Senior Executive's Forum was held at the Tower Club in Tysons Corner. Participants, including Chairman Gerald Connolly, Board of Trade President Bob Peck, Bill Lecos from the Fairfax County Chamber, Delegate Jim Scott, representatives from the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments, and corporations in Fairfax County and the region kicked off a major effort to enlist the private sector in the project to meet the region's telework goal.

Fairfax County Government, through its Employer Services Program, assists businesses and employees to find transportation solutions, including telework programs. During 2004, Employer Services Program staff conducted a number of employer site outreach visits within the count.

Continued

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

Regional efforts, as described above, are most effective in bringing attention to telework and challenging major employers, public and private, to increase the number of teleworkers.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

Fairfax County government will continue to be an active participant and a role model in regional efforts to increase teleworking.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2006? If so, please explain.

The Telework Expansion Project is funded within the department budgets of Information Technology, Human Resources, and Public Affairs.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

A continued adequate level of funding for the Telework Expansion Project is anticipated.

Response to 2004 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Land Use and Transportation #2c (Teleworking)

(Page 29 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC recommends that the Board of Supervisors work with the Federal government to encourage an increase in teleworking. Further, we recommend the BOS work closely with the Virginia Congressional Delegation to secure resources to establish teleworking sites within the county.

Lead agencies for this response: County Executive's Office

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: None

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Catherine Chianese

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

Fairfax County government is an active partner with members of its state and federal delegations to secure funding for telework initiatives and for passage of legislation that supports telework.

The Fairfax County Board of Supervisors and staff regularly review and comment on funding proposals and legislative initiatives that advance telework in the region.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

Recommendation is being addressed.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

Fairfax County will continue to monitor, evaluate, and propose funding and legislative initiatives that advance telework in the region.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2006? If so, please explain.

No budget impact anticipated.

Land Use and Transportation #2c
Continued

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

No budget impact anticipated.

Response to 2004 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Land Use and Transportation #3a (Transportation)

(Page 29 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC commends the Board of Supervisors for funding the Non-Motorized Transportation (Trails) Committee in FY 2005. EQAC recommends that the Board continue to provide annual funding to this Committee to implement those projects that have the greatest potential for increasing non-motorized methods of transportation within the county.

Lead agencies for this response: DPZ & DOT

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: None

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Sheng Leu (DPZ) and Chris Wells (DOT)

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

As established by charter adopted by the Board of Supervisors, the Countywide Non-motorized Transportation (Trails) Committee has a frame work in place for recommending an annual program for the funding and construction of trails and for establishing priorities for the construction of trails identified in the Comprehensive Plan. In December 2003, the Board endorsed the Non-motorized Transportation Committee's Trails Plan priorities, which is a critical element of a capital plan for funding Countywide trails as well as pedestrian facilities.

In June 2003, the Board of Supervisors approved the composition of a Pedestrian Task Force. Part of the mission of the Pedestrian Task Force is to produce a 10-Year Capital Plan for pedestrian facilities. This Task Force began work in the first half of 2004. Completion of a 10-year capital plan for pedestrian facilities will complement the activities and funding and priority recommendations developed by the Trails Committee and will assist the Board in implementing projects that have the greatest potential for increasing non-motorized methods of transportation within the County.

In the past the Board has provided funding by magisterial district for trail projects. Such funding has been limited due to budget reductions. On November 2, 2004, however, County voters approved a \$165 million General Obligation Bond Referendum as part of the Board's four-year Transportation Plan.

Within the Board's four-year Transportation Plan, \$10.8 million was designated to fund Countywide pedestrian improvements such as sidewalks and trails, and improvements for bus stops and crosswalks, as well as pedestrian improvements for the Richmond Highway Initiative. In addition, the Board of Supervisors appropriated an additional \$2.5 million in general funds as part of the FY 2005 Budget for streetlight, drainage, sidewalk, trail and walkway projects. Of this general fund amount, \$676,000 was earmarked for sidewalks and trails construction. As there are still numerous missing links along the major commuting and recreational trails in the County, both the Non-Motorized Transportation Committee and the Pedestrian Task Force are currently developing a list of priority projects to be completed using both available and future funds to achieve a comprehensive interconnected trails system throughout the County.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

Staff supports the recommendation for continued funding for pedestrian improvements.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

The Pedestrian Task Force should complete the 10-year capital plan for pedestrian facilities in 2005. The Trails Committee should continue its annual review of program priorities and recommendations for construction in coordination with the Departments of Planning and Zoning, Transportation, and Public Works and Environmental Services.

As additional resources will be needed to achieve improved pedestrian access and to provide a comprehensive, interconnected trails system throughout the County, continued funding of pedestrian improvements should be provided.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2006? If so, please explain.

Yes. Continued pedestrian access/trail improvements will require a continuing financial commitment on the part of the Board of Supervisors.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

Yes. Continued pedestrian access/trail improvements will require a continuing financial commitment on the part of the Board of Supervisors. Based on knowledge of current conditions, it is reasonable to anticipate that the 10-year pedestrian capital plan and on-going review of trails priorities will identify a significant need for improvements and projects. Funding these improvements will have substantial costs.

Response to 2004 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Land Use and Transportation #3b (Transportation)

(Page 29 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC is looking forward to the results of the 2004 Transportation Update to the Master Plan. We recommend that direction be given to model transit improvements as well as dynamic attributes such as HOT lanes.

Lead agencies for this response: DOT

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: None

Please identify a lead agency contact person: David Kline

**Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed?
If so, please provide details.**

The County's Department of Transportation is currently conducting a comprehensive review of the Transportation Plan which will evaluate future land use alternatives and transportation networks on the macro level. A key aspect of this review process will be to refine and make operational a County-wide transportation model. The model will be utilized in analyzing future transportation networks including transit improvements. However, it should be noted that detailed transit modeling on a corridor or sub-area basis, which may be the intent of this recommendation, is a very sophisticated effort and requires considerably more resources than have been allocated to this Transportation Plan Update to date.

Modeling HOT lanes is an even more sophisticated endeavor than modeling transit improvements. While the Transportation Plan Update will include HOV lanes in the transportation networks evaluated, and this will give an indication of the viability of HOT lanes, the technical aspects of HOT lane transportation modeling are not being addressed as part of the Transportation Plan Update.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

We concur that in the long term it would be desirable for the County to develop the capability to model transit improvements at a detailed (or subzone) level.

However, for the purposes of this year's Transportation Plan Update, modeling at the macro level is adequate. Modeling transit improvements at a more detailed level can be done in subsequent processes such as corridor or sub-area studies. We believe that HOT lane modeling is such a new technical enterprise that it should be done by others for the time being.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

FCDOT should investigate the options and opportunities to pursue more transit modeling in-house. This endeavor would require more resources.

The County should encourage the MWCOG/TPB to include HOT Lane issues as part of their regular model enhancement program.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2006? If so, please explain.

If more detailed transit modeling is required or desired to be added to the scope of the existing consultant contract for the Transportation Plan Update, additional funding would be needed in FY 2006.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

At present there is no future funding for consultant assistance to conduct the more detailed and intensive transportation modeling that is required to analyze specific transit improvements or HOT Lanes.

Response to 2004 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Land Use and Transportation #3c (Transportation)

(Page 29 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC recommends that the county focus on improving transit utilization through a systematic plan that focus on multiple options within a community. For example, the Virginia Railway Express (VRE) Burke EZ Bus provides a convenient alternative to commuting to the Burke VRE station. This can be combined with pedestrian improvements, more connector bus options, and biking trails that together provide a diverse transportation plan.

Lead agencies for this response: DOT

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: DPZ

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Leonard Wolfenstein

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

This recommendation is being addressed on an ongoing basis. The recommendation speaks to the need to conduct “multi-modal” transportation planning. With respect to transit, the recommendation speaks to the need to consider all phases of a passenger’s trip, (e.g. frequent bus service is not attractive if there is no pedestrian access to the bus stop and the stop is not a safe or comfortable place to wait for the bus).

Over the last few years, the County Department of Transportation has structured itself in a way that leads to more systematic and multi-modal solutions to transportation challenges. The Board has directed the department to initiate a number of projects which are relevant to this recommendation. Examples are:

- Bus Stop Inventory Study – This study (to be completed in 2005) identifies pedestrian access improvements needed at bus stops Countywide.
- Richmond Highway Public Transportation Initiative – In addition to improving bus service, this initiative has secured millions of dollars to improve bus stops, sidewalks and intersection safety for pedestrians. This service, also known as the South County Bus Plan was implemented in September 2004.
- 10-Year Pedestrian Capital Plan – A pedestrian task force was formed in 2004 to develop a safety awareness campaign and a 10 year pedestrian capital plan. County staff and citizens are on the task force.

- EZ Bus – This innovative service was initiated in December 2003 to provide an alternate means of access to commuter rail as the parking at Burke Centre VRE is at capacity.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

This recommendation is being addressed to the degree that available manpower and funding resources allow.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

Transit service planning is done on an on-going basis; however it is done within financial constraints. As staffing resources and funding permit, it is worthwhile to expand efforts to improve transit utilization through multiple-option systematic approaches. In addition, there is a need for a Comprehensive County Bus Service Development Plan to improve transit service throughout the County.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2006? If so, please explain.

There would be considerable fiscal impacts related to any expanded efforts to improve transit utilization through the development and implementation of systematic plans and initiatives, and even more with expanding service.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

Yes – Providing the capital improvements and the cost of transit service operating subsidies associated with this recommendation would be substantial. Current resources in both manpower and funding are insufficient for the development of a Comprehensive Bus Service Development Plan.

Response to 2004 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Land Use and Transportation #3d (Transportation)

(Page 29 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC recommends that the county instruct the Health Department and the Public Affairs Office to produce and disseminate brochure(s) explaining the interrelationship between commuter choices and public health. This should include information about the various alternatives discussed in this chapter.

LEAD AGENCY: Health

COORDINATING AGENCY/IES: DOT; OPA

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Glenn Smith

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

Air quality outreach efforts are being addressed by the County's Air Quality Subcommittee. Efforts are currently under way to expand the distribution of existing outreach materials and to develop new brochures. The following table addresses some of the outreach efforts underway for FY2005:

<i>Make the Clean Air Partners general ozone brochure widely available in Fairfax County</i>	
<u>General Description</u>	<u>Implementation Steps and Timeline</u>
<i>Copies of the brochure would be printed and made available at a variety of points of contact throughout the county.</i>	<i>We planned to do this last year, but due to changes that Clean Air Partners made in the text of the brochure in early June, printing of our copies was not able to take place last season.</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><i>• First, contact Beth Francis in DOT to determine when and where the brochures should be delivered in order to be placed in the brochure racks from May - October.</i><i>• Do some design modifications to make sure all the key messages Fairfax County wants are added to existing brochure. These include messages encouraging county residents to replace their two-cycle mowing equipment with four-cycle equipment or other lower emissions lawn equipment; and to encourage replacing portable fuel cans with the new units to reduce VOCs. Work with Park Authority (Ron Pearson) to determine proper message.</i><i>• Print the brochure in April.</i><i>• In May the modified Clean Air Partners general brochure "We are all part of the solution" would be placed in brochure racks and/or on information counters in FCPA RECenters (8), Health Department Clinics(8), Fairfax County governmental centers(12), county office buildings(8), County</i>
<u>Expense</u> <i>The print shop quote was \$2,500 for 20,000 3.6"x 8.5" size, two-sided brochures printed on glossy card stock. . This</i>	

Land Use and Transportation 3d
Continued

<p><i>is 4-color process with a bleed. This is approximately enough for volunteers to distribute at community meetings and for 100 copies in each location during the ozone season.</i></p>	<p><i>community centers(8), senior centers (13), libraries(22), and school offices(235), beginning during the 2005 ozone season. The distribution of these brochures would be coordinated through the use of the interoffice mail system with the assistance of the agencies involved. Also, Fairfax Connector offered to allow us to piggy-back on the distribution of existing Fairfax Connector brochures in many of these locations to lower the cost to distribute them.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• The management in area malls(7), grocery stores and at Metro stations(8), should be contacted in April in order to get their permission to include the Clean Air Partners general brochure “We are all part of the solution” in their information areas and brochure racks, at least during the ozone season. Again, This brochure could also be piggybacked on the distribution of Fairfax Connector brochures in many of these locations to lower the cost to distribute them. Also, staff could work with Fairfax Connector staff to distribute brochures advertising free bus rides on Air Quality Action Days.</i> <i>• Existing Fairfax Connector brochures could be placed in the interior of Fairfax Connector buses promoting the free bus rides on all Northern Virginia bus routes on Air Quality Action Days.</i> <p><i>Lower Priority</i></p> <p><i>Posters could be placed in high density parking areas promoting free connector rides (e.g., places like the Government Center parking lots, parking garages in Crystal City or the parking lots at the Pentagon). This would encourage non-transit users to try transit.</i></p> <p><i>A vendor could do this with oversight from OPA staff to make sure the brochure design is appropriate and distribution plan is adhered to.</i></p>
---	---

<i>Distribute to FCPS students a child-friendly brochure about ground level ozone</i>	
<p><u>General Description</u></p> <p><i>A bookmark/brochure would be developed aimed specifically at elementary students.</i></p>	<p><u>Implementation Steps and Timeline</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• This must be handled in concert with the regional Clean Air Partners Campaign.</i> <i>• Contact Clean Air partners staff to get the brochures (Be a Part of the Solution) in electronic format in February.</i> <i>• Modify the basic design to have some Fairfax-centric information on it and make it kid friendly.</i> <i>• In order to penetrate the schools, the fliers would need to be printed and to the schools for review approval and distribution the second week of April in order to be distributed in May. Bearing that in mind, design work would need to take place in early to mid-March.</i> <i>• Began talks with Schools staff regarding this project last spring, but would recommend that someone follow up with the community relations office, sending them a sample of what is to be distributed to make sure that they are okay</i>
<p><u>Expense</u></p> <p><i>The print shop quote was \$6,800 for 175,000 3.6” x 8.5” brochures printed on glossy card stock. This is 4-color process with a bleed.</i></p>	

	<p><i>with the content before printing the brochures.</i></p> <p><i>A vendor could handle the design and printing of brochure/bookmark with oversight from OPA. The approval process to get them in the schools would be handled by OPA.</i></p>
--	---

<i>Implement a ground level ozone awareness campaign for County Employees</i>	
<p><u>General Description</u> <i>The Office of Public Affairs would pursue a number of avenues to increase County employees' awareness of ozone-related issues</i></p>	<p><u>Implementation Steps and Timeline</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Work with Courier editor to plan an annual article for the Courier employee newsletter in May that will include information about the various color coded levels used to let the public know about air quality and ways in which they should modify their behavior on code orange or code red days. It will also discuss how making certain lifestyle changes for individuals and policy changes for the County will help to reduce emissions of NOx and VOCs that contribute to the poor air quality.</i> • <i>In addition to the current practice of sending alerts to staff via NewsLink to notify them of episodic actions to take, begin to use NewsLink as a tool to send periodic educational messages about ground level ozone, how it affects one's health and how to help fight it.</i> • <i>Electronically distribute the Clean Air Partners general information brochure, "We are All Part of the Solution," to agency directors in early May and encourage them to discuss air quality issues with their staff as they pertain to their department. Include information about ridesharing, teleworking and transit services in the email. Send the brochure along with a memo from the County Executive regarding the county's air quality best practices. Also distribute a file of a poster that can be printed out and prominently posted during ozone season to remind employees of actions to take to reduce emissions and ground level ozone.</i> • <i>Include an air quality informational message in early May on the pay advice sent semiweekly to employees.</i> <p><u>Less Urgent</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Work with the telework coordinator to find ways to expand promotion of telework. Use information such as specific percentages of teleworkers in each agency to encourage supervisors to promote behaviors like telework on Air Quality Action Days in order to drive up participation.</i> <p><i>These strategies would need to be undertaken by an OPA staff person. They are all internally driven and the contacts to execute these tasks are mainly in OPA. If necessary, the drafting of the messages for NewsLink and the communication to SMT could be</i></p>
<p><u>Expense</u> <i>\$500 for posters/flyers to go in county buildings and other high traffic locations, as permitted. (Kinkos quoted \$341.72 for 300 legal/ledger sized posters one sided glossy 4 color process with a bleed.)</i></p>	

	<i>handled by a vendor as a part of the overall message development for this project.</i>
--	---

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2006? If so, please explain.

For FY2005, OPA currently has \$15,000 to fund printing of the brochures.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

Continued cost to update, reprint, and distribute.

Response to 2004 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Land Use and Transportation #3e (Transportation)

(Page 29 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC recommends that the Board of Supervisors urge the State Police to fully enforce HOV restrictions and to increase the penalty for HOV violations. EQAC recommends that the Board request that HOV fines be increased to \$500 for the second offense, with 50% of the fine returned to the respective County.

Lead agencies for this response: Police

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: DOT; County Attorney

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Major Mike LoMonaco

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

The Fairfax County Police Department, Traffic Division, assists the Virginia State Police on targeted H.O.V. violation campaigns several times a year. However, the Virginia State Police is the primary enforcement agency on the interstate highway system in Fairfax County. They enforce the H.O.V. regulations as frequently as staffing allows.

Based on existing staffing, it would be difficult for the Virginia State Police to more fully enforce H.O.V. violations short of some type of photo enforcement.

The issue of increasing fines has not been addressed.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

If increased staffing resources are not specifically dedicated to the State Police to allow for more officers on this assignment or “photo H.O.V. violations” are not authorized, H.O.V. violations cannot be fully enforced.

The Fairfax County Police Department and the Department of Transportation concur with the recommendation to have 50% of the fine returned to the County. This funding could be potentially earmarked for enhanced enforcement and education.

The current fines of \$50.00 for a first offense, \$200.00 for a second offense, \$500.00 for a third offense, and \$1,000.00 for a fourth offense are adequate.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

The County Attorney's Office should draft legislation to be submitted for consideration in the January 2006 Legislative Session.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2006? If so, please explain.

No, it is not possible to amend the Virginia State Code in time to influence the FY 2006 Budget.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

The extra funds generated would have a positive impact on the Fairfax County budget.

Response to 2004 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Air Quality #1

(Page 50 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

We recommend full funding for staff in the Health Department supporting air quality management activities in the county. With respect to air quality management, our weakness has become our institutional capability to track air quality trends and help set the stage to understand where local controls are most needed. Health Department staff are now so busy addressing other issues that they can no longer provide sufficient assistance with air quality matters. We are very concerned that our monitoring capability risks becoming compromised, and we have now heard concerns expressed about that both at the state and regional levels. We strongly support maintenance, including replacement of expertise in the county Health Department so that they can provide appropriate coordination and support for the activities for the Air Quality Subcommittee. The emphasis here, initially, needs to be on the ability to restore historic perspective on trends and atmospheric science associated with the formation of ozone. The maintenance and management of the monitoring network is critical to this exercise, and the Health Department should be in a position to provide support and management so that, if necessary, the monitoring network can be expanded. Finally, we continue to believe that Air Quality Planning capability is necessary in the Health Department.

LEAD AGENCY: Health

COORDINATING AGENCY/IES: Environmental Coordinator; ECC Air Quality Subcommittee

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Glenn Smith

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

This recommendation has been addressed.

The county did not have a dedicated staff member or agency specifically to concentrate on air quality issues and regulatory impacts. The Environmental Coordinator position had been fulfilling this responsibility for the past several years in addition to his other responsibilities. However, air issues began overtaking all other issues, which were not getting proper attention.

Staff from the Health Department and the Environmental Coordinator discussed this concern and established a merit position specifically to focus on air quality issues. This position has been filled as an Environmental Health Program Manager with a working title of Air Quality Program Manager. The position is placed in the current Health Department structure and has

Air Quality #1

Continued

a dual reporting role in that the position is under the supervision of both the Director of the Division of Environmental Health and the Environmental Coordinator. The Air Quality Program Manager will have countywide responsibilities of all air quality issues, will chair the Air Quality subcommittee of the Environmental Coordinating Committee (ECC), and will be a regular member of the ECC.

Currently, the Air Quality Monitoring Program consists of:

- 1-Program Manager
- 1-Data Analyst
- 3-Monitoring Specialists

Staff expertise on new monitoring technologies and techniques are enhanced by attending training clinics and seminars as they become available. In addition to the routine quality assurance/quality control that each monitoring analyzer undergoes, the network is audited by the EPA and by the Commonwealth of Virginia, Division Environment Quality. These audits ensure that the data reported are accurate and of the highest quality.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2006? If so, please explain.

The Air Quality Program Manager position has been recruited and position funding established. An annual instrument replacement fund of \$30,000 is in place with an additional \$50,000 having been added for FY2005. All outdated analyzers are in the process of being replaced.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

Continued funding for the Air Quality Monitoring Program.

Response to 2004 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Air Quality #2

(Page 50 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

We continue to be concerned about coordination and integration of critical analysis and conclusions about air quality management in the county. We recognize that the county has decided not to accept our suggested approach to staffing up for air quality management and planning purposes and have decided to pursue their own path on this subject. In general, we are pleased with the work of the AQS in identifying both quantifiable and qualifiable emission reduction measures and strategies as well as promoting clean air education programs and initiatives, however, we continue to be concerned regarding the county's ability to maintain this effort in a systematic and strategic manner. We continue to recommend close coordination and communication between EQAC and the county on immediate activities necessary to comply with the ozone standard in 2005 and on into the future.

LEAD AGENCY: Environmental Coordinator

COORDINATING AGENCY/IES: ECC Air Quality Subcommittee

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Kambiz Agazi

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

This recommendation is continuing to be addressed.

The staff agrees with and fully supports EQAC's recommendation to continue and to intensify close coordination and communication on immediate activities necessary to achieve earliest possible compliance with the ozone standard, and to continue those efforts long beyond the coming year.

Coordination and communication between EQAC and County staff have advanced significantly over the last three years. The staff welcomes and looks forward to further substantive and actionable recommendations from EQAC on ozone mitigation measures and all other air quality issues, and actively solicits their inputs for the Air Quality Management Plan.

Below is a brief description of the ECC's joint meeting initiative with EQAC, and a description of the ongoing work of the County's Air Quality Subcommittee.

In February 2002, the ECC and EQAC scheduled, for the first time ever, a joint meeting to exchange information and ideas, and to discuss a broad range of environmental issues as it related to EQAC's Annual Report on the Environment. The meeting was strategic in the sense

Air Quality #2

Continued

that it looked at both short-term and longer-term issues, and where appropriate, linkages were made to the County strategic planning process, environmental policy, budget implications, and program organization and structure. A second meeting was held in July 2002, and subsequent joint meetings have continued to be conducted on a semi-annual basis. The next joint meeting of the ECC and EQAC is scheduled for July 2005.

On November 15, 2002, Deputy County Executive Robert A. Stalzer sent a letter to the Environmental Quality Advisory Council (EQAC), outlining a collaborative approach for reviewing the County's air quality efforts. The process included discussions between the County's Environmental Coordinating Committee (ECC) and EQAC on how best to identify the issues and provide recommendations to the Board of Supervisors to improve the County's air quality. The ECC is an interagency committee that ensures an appropriate level of coordination and review of the County's environmental policies and initiatives.

Following deliberations on the issue, it was decided that the ECC would establish an Air Quality Subcommittee to conduct a thorough review of air quality issues facing Fairfax County and to prepare recommendations for consideration by the ECC. On May 9, 2003, the ECC in collaboration with EQAC formally chartered an Air Quality Subcommittee. The subcommittee was given the task of developing recommendations to improve air quality in support of the regional air quality planning efforts and the County Executive's February 12, 2003 "Declaration on Air Quality Leadership" statement.

On July 21, 2003, the Air Quality Subcommittee presented a work program to both the ECC and EQAC outlining each task and indicating a timeline for completion. This study began in August 2003 and was divided into four thematic areas with work group teams assigned to reviewing County air quality goals and policies, codes and regulations, measures and practices, and education and notification process to determine whether modifications were needed.

In November 2003, the subcommittee presented the research to the ECC and EQAC as a draft fact-based "findings" document outlining what we know about air quality in the County and the region. This document is a comprehensive report of the findings of each work group. After receiving ECC comments, the subcommittee released a second draft in January 2004, and presented it to EQAC for their review and comment.

In December 2003, the subcommittee began developing conceptual recommendations to strengthen the County's existing air quality management efforts. The development of the conceptual recommendations was based in large part on the findings document. The subcommittee also initiated informal contacts with EQAC to help strengthen the first draft of these recommendations. The conceptual recommendations were reviewed by the ECC, and presented to the Board of Supervisors at their Environmental Committee meeting held on January 30th. An electronic and hard copy were further distributed to EQAC for their information and review.

The subcommittee held a community forum on February 25, 2004 to provide information to the public about the study and to receive public comments about County and regional air quality management planning efforts, the "findings" document, and the recommendations.

Air Quality #2
Continued

On April 19, 2004, the AQS presented its final report (“Improving Air Quality in the Washington Metropolitan Region, Fairfax County’s Commitment to Air Quality Excellence—2004 Air Quality Protection Strategy Recommendations”) to the BOS. A summary of the recommendations in the report was also presented in the style of a classic laminated restaurant menu. The “Clean Air Café” Menu was an illustrative summary to the report with recommendations disguised as menu items with costs shown to the right. The first section of recommendations was referred to as “Starters” and included those recommendations that the BOS had previously committed to. The next section of recommendations was referred to as “Chef’s Specials” and included additional measures that were being recommended by the AQS for BOS consideration. The development of the final report and the “Menu” were based on the findings and conceptual recommendations documents, as well as the input received from the community forum. It was noted that the AQS would continue to consider additional ideas that were developed internally and/or presented at the February 25 Air Quality Forum.

The staff, and especially the Air Quality Subcommittee, look forward to working with the Board of Supervisors and EQAC to improve further the air quality in Fairfax County and the region.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

This recommendation is continuing to be addressed.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC’s recommendation?

See explanation above.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2006? If so, please explain.

No.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

Longer-range fiscal implications were noted in the Air Quality Management Plan implementation matrix that was presented to the BOS on September 20, 2004.

Response to 2004 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Air Quality #3

(Page 50 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC is pleased with the work of the county's Air Quality Subcommittee that included a variety of air quality management strategies as shown in the interim report and Clean Air Café menu that was presented to the Board of Supervisors' Environmental Committee. EQAC recommends that the Board adopt and implement the recommendations shown in the menu and report.

LEAD AGENCY: Environmental Coordinator

COORDINATING AGENCY/IES: ECC Air Quality Subcommittee

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Kambiz Agazi

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

This recommendation is in the process of being addressed.

The staff agrees with and fully supports EQAC's recommendation to implement the recommendations as shown in the interim report and Clean Air Café menu that was presented to the Board of Supervisors' Environmental Committee on April 19, 2004. Below is a brief description of the status of implementation of the recommendations.

Many of the recommendations were identified on the Menu as being "complimentary," in that, while they require staff and other resources to implement, they do not require additional budget allocations. Other recommendations were presented with specific cost information, while still others were identified with a cost that may vary depending on the extent of implementation. On June 14, 2004, the AQS presented to the BOS an overview of staff's suggested implementation steps, and the timing of these steps, for the "complimentary" recommendations. The Environmental Committee of the BOS recommended that county staff should proceed with the implementation of all "complimentary" recommendations and that further guidance should be provided regarding recommendations involving additional costs

On September 20, 2004, the AQS presented an overview of those recommendations that have involved and/or will involve funding allocations on the part of the BOS. Included was information regarding funding that had already been allocated, additional funding that would be needed, and benefits associated with the recommendations. Several of the key recommendations, including wind energy purchase, education and outreach, pedestrian improvements and low-emission diesel bus retrofits were funded by FY04 carry-over funds and have been or are in the process of being implemented.

Air Quality #3
Continued

The remaining program recommendations and emission reduction measures will be funded and implemented in phases. The prioritization of the program recommendations and emission reduction measures will be based on the immediacy of the issue and the nature and cost-effectiveness of the emission reduction measure. Below is a summary of the costs associated with program implementation for those recommendations that the BOS has funded as of September 2004.

<u>Recommendation</u>	<u>Funding Allocated (millions of dollars)</u>
Clean-fueled public transportation vehicles	1.630
Retrofit of diesel school buses	2.000
Retrofit of diesel trucks	0.234
Hybrid vehicle purchase	0.361 (57 vehicles)
No vapor fuel cans	0.005
Transfer station upgrade	0.050
Public outreach and education	0.015
Pedestrian Improvements	17.175
Green infrastructure	0.0180
Air quality monitoring equipment	0.0500
5% wind energy purchase for county facilities	0.105/year
Expand metrocheck program to all county employees	0.458/year (0.040 already allocated)

The staff, and especially the Air Quality Subcommittee, look forward to working with the Board of Supervisors and EQAC to further improve air quality in Fairfax County and the region.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

This recommendation is continuing to be addressed.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

See explanation above.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2006? If so, please explain.

No.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

Longer-range fiscal implications were noted in the Air Quality Management Plan implementation matrix that was presented to the BOS on September 20, 2004.

Response to 2004 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Water Resources #1

(Page III-100 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC cannot over-emphasize and support the importance of creating a Stormwater Environmental Utility Fee Program for funding of the county's watershed protection and restoration needs. The Stormwater Environmental Utility Fee program is essential to carrying out the recommendations of the Comprehensive Watershed Plans being created throughout the county.

Lead agencies for this response: DPWES (SWPD)

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: None

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Krystal Kearns

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

Yes, this recommendation is being addressed.

Fairfax County hired the consulting firm AMEC, which developed a Watershed Community Needs Assessment and Funding Options Study (July 2004) to address the strategies for developing a comprehensive stormwater management program and a dedicated funding mechanism to support it. The plan will address program needs which include watershed planning, capital improvements, changing service levels, increased infrastructure inventories, unfunded mandates, and emergency events and "developing and implementing a funding feasibility study for alternative methods and funding sources." In addition to the study, AMEC is facilitating a series of meetings for a Board of Supervisors-appointed committee of residents who are reviewing the level and extent of service of the current stormwater management program and possible funding sources.

The committee is named the Stormwater Advisory Committee and is made up of 17 residents that represent a diversity of community interests. The residents were appointed to the committee by the Board of Supervisors in August, September, and October 2004. The committee members began meeting once per month in October 2004 to review the current stormwater program, identify future needs and possible funding sources. The committee will continue to meet until March 2005 to develop their recommendations for improvements to the current program and a dedicated funding source to finance the improvements. The committee will propose their recommendations to the members of the Board of Supervisors in March 2005.

Other options being considered by the county include dedicating a portion of the real estate tax for stormwater management.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

Staff agrees with EQAC's recommendation. In order to improve the current stormwater management program and complete recommendations made through the watershed management plans, a sustainable and equitable funding source is necessary.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

A needs and expectations assessment is currently underway to address the importance of creating a dedicated source of funding for stormwater management. The Stormwater Advisory Committee is working with Fairfax County and the hired Consultant AMEC to develop recommendations to the current program and present them to the Board of Supervisors in March 2005.

The county is expected to continue to work with members of the Board-appointed Stormwater Advisory Committee and the consultant to provide information as they develop the recommendations for the members of the Board of Supervisors.

The county has initiated a Speaker's Bureau to present information about stormwater management, the challenges facing the county's current program, and the Stormwater Needs Assessment Project working to address these challenges. This outreach effort is targeted at groups, organizations, and associations in Fairfax County. The Speakers Bureau's intent is to raise awareness about the issues facing the county with respect to stormwater management and to make residents aware of the project working to face those issues.

In addition to the Speakers Bureau, the county has developed a Web site to communicate the Stormwater Needs Assessment Project to residents. Residents can visit this site and review agendas and meeting minutes of the Stormwater Advisory Committee meetings. Residents can also sign up to receive monthly updates about the project.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2006? If so, please explain.

It is anticipated that the Board of Supervisors will consider a dedicated source of funding during the FY 2006 Budget hearings. Additional staff positions would be necessary to operate the program.

In the County Executive's proposed FY 2006 budget to the members of the Board of Supervisors, one penny of the Real Estate Tax is recommended to be dedicated for the stormwater management program. The total amount is \$17.9 million and includes three new staff positions. The funds are earmarked for accelerating the completion of watershed plan development, initiating watershed plan implementation, and initiating the rehabilitation of the stormwater infrastructure.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

Yes. A dedicated funding source such as a stormwater utility fee would provide the resources needed to implement and sustain a comprehensive stormwater management program. Additional staff positions would be necessary to operate the program.

A dedicated funding source such as a stormwater utility fee would be used to improve the Fairfax County stormwater management program by, among other things:

- ❖ Improving stormwater management facilities;
- ❖ Replacing the aging storm drain network infrastructure;
- ❖ Reducing response time to improve stormwater infrastructure;
- ❖ Increasing the number of plans developed by engineers for flood proofing;
- ❖ Improving water quality in streams;
- ❖ Increasing the public outreach and involvement efforts;
- ❖ Increasing the number of stream restoration projects;
- ❖ Meeting local, state, and federal mandates;
- ❖ Preventing dam failures;
- ❖ Implementing capital projects; and
- ❖ Implementing recommendations from the watershed management plans.

Response to 2004 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Water Resources #2

(Page 101 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC recommends that increased emphasis be placed on monitoring and enforcement of predevelopment stormwater management controls and the re-examination of “adequate outfall” requirements.

Recent research has shown that over 60% of the sediments in damaged streams are the direct result of stream bank erosion. Streams can become damaged by the changes brought about by changes in stream hydrology and increased flow during the pre-development clearing phase. The stream sees an overall increased flow due to the increased runoff caused by the clearing. This is not just the increase in peak flow, but the increase in the total volume of the water entering the stream. These increased flows start the cycle of damage, and once the stream is damaged it may take years or decades for the stream banks to revegetate and restabilize. Also, expensive stream bank stabilization projects may be required. Prevention of such damage would not only be good for the environment but would also be cost effective. Prevention of this damage can be assisted by strict monitoring and enforcement of the stormwater management control system prior to construction and not allowing predevelopment runoff flows to increase during the development phase.

Lead agencies for this response: DPWES(LDS)

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: SWPD

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Jeff Blackford

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

This recommendation is in the process of being addressed.

Staff is collaborating with members of industry to develop recommendations to address the increase in stormwater runoff from development sites during the development of the site. In addition, staff is collaborating with members of industry to develop recommendations for enhancing the minimum standards for erosion and sediment control on larger scale developments to better protect downstream properties from runoff. A third initiative is being undertaken with a committee of private sector engineers to examine the County’s definition and requirements pertaining to adequate outfall. Following the work of these committees, policy clarifications and or amendments to the Fairfax County Public Facilities Manual will be processed for consideration by the Board.

Water Resources #2

Continued

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

See above.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

Implementation of the study recommendations as described above is required.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2006? If so, please explain.

No.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

Unknown at this time. However, the final recommendations may result in the need for additional inspection and review staff.

Response to 2004 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Water Resources #3

(Page 101 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC strongly recommends that Fairfax County (the Board of Supervisors, the Planning Commission, the Board of Zoning Appeals, the Fairfax County Park Authority and various county agencies) continue to develop methodology that incorporates into their land use considerations a protocol that would assist them on the individual and cumulative effect of such decisions on the county's waterways. EQAC urges them to use this information to protect the county's waters, including its lakes, streams, and drinking water supply reservoir. EQAC commends the Board for adopting Residential Development Criteria that include criteria supporting the provision of adequate drainage outfalls and innovative water quality measures; EQAC views this action as a step in the direction of satisfying this recommendation.

Land use planning and transportation planning are the single most effective tools for the protection of streams and rivers. Structure siting, Best Management Practices, and Low Impact Development techniques could be more effectively used within the county to protect local streams.

Lead agencies for this response: DPZ

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: DPWES (SWPD; LDS); DOT; FCPA;
NVSWCD

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Noel Kaplan

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

Progress in addressing EQAC's recommendation, which is a continuation from a recommendation made last year, continues at both the watershed scale and the project-specific scale. Key actions include watershed management planning, strengthening of submission requirements for zoning cases, and better interagency coordination during the zoning process.

The County is continuing its multi-year effort to develop watershed management plans for all thirty of the County's watersheds. By the end of 2004, approximately 60 percent of the County (11 watersheds) had Watershed Management Plans in development. The Little Hunting Creek Plan was adopted by the Board of Supervisors in February, 2005. Four other watershed plans are currently being developed. The Cub Run/Bull Run and Cameron Run Final Watershed Management Plans will be completed by the end of 2005. Difficult Run should have a Draft Final Watershed Management Plan completed by the end of 2005. The final plan for the five

watersheds, under the Pimmit Run/Middle Potomac watershed planning effort, is scheduled for completion in early 2006.

Through this effort, existing land use conditions, projected future land use conditions, and stream conditions within watersheds are being evaluated, and watershed-specific recommendations to address water resources are being developed; areas with potential land use changes within each watershed are being identified, and implications of land use changes to water resources are being assessed. This effort is resulting in the identification of specific recommended stormwater management and restoration projects; while planning and zoning designations are not being reconsidered through this effort, the watershed management planning process can highlight specific areas where land use changes will be of particular concern, and it is anticipated that broad policy considerations with countywide implications (which may include land use issues) will be considered upon the completion of the first set of watershed management plans.

The County has examined its regional pond policy and is now utilizing a matrix that can be applied to determine optimal stormwater management solutions within specific watersheds or subwatersheds. Each watershed plan will examine alternative stormwater management techniques to the planned regional ponds. This analysis will consider upstream culvert BMP retrofit opportunities, low impact development practices within designated areas/zones, specific bioretention facilities, existing onsite SWM retrofits, possible new multi-site SWM facilities in desirable locations, etc.

On March 29, 2004, the Board of Supervisors adopted an amendment to the Zoning Ordinance that strengthened the stormwater management submission requirements for zoning applications (rezonings, special exceptions, special permits, and related applications). This amendment became effective on July 1, 2004. Specifically, all plats or development plans associated with such applications must include the location, estimated size of facility footprint in area, and type of all stormwater management facilities, including the full extent of side slopes, embankments, spillways, dams, and water surface elevations of design storms, if applicable. In addition, all applications are required to include a preliminary stormwater management plan that contains information about the adequacy of downstream drainage, including the sufficiency of capacity of any streams, drainageways, and/or storm drainage pipes into which stormwater runoff from the site will be conveyed. Any such application involving a land disturbance of 2,500 square feet or more must include additional graphic and narrative information regarding the proposed stormwater management system for the development, including information regarding existing outfall conditions for each watercourse receiving drainage from the site and a description of how adequate outfall requirements of the Public Facilities Manual will be satisfied. The amendment also significantly restricts the extent to which the limits of clearing and grading for stormwater management facilities can be expanded (such expansions are not permissible where they will result in a reduction of non-stormwater management open space, tree save, and/or landscaping area on the property in question). The desired effect of this restriction (along with the strengthened submission requirements) is to ensure that applicants will have done a sufficient amount of preliminary analysis of stormwater management needs and solutions and that the stormwater management systems that are presented on development plans will be viable and effective in protecting downstream resources.

Concurrent with the adoption of the aforementioned Zoning Ordinance Amendment, it was recognized by staff that there was a need for more technical staff analysis regarding stormwater management issues during the zoning process. DPWES has committed to providing a preliminary analysis of the sizing of the proposed stormwater management facility and the adequacy of outfall submitted by applicants at the zoning stage. As a result of this commitment, DPWES is reviewing each rezoning, special exception and special permit application and is providing written comments on the stormwater management facility design and other drainage issues for incorporation into the staff analysis of the application. The level of review by DPWES that is occurring during the zoning process is being done through the use of an existing computer algorithm to verify the adequacy of outfall, and through the review of existing drainage conditions in the vicinity of the proposal. Although the review of the proposed stormwater management and outfall adequacy that is occurring as a result of this amendment at the zoning stage will not be as extensive as the review that occurs at the time of site plan/subdivision plat review, this process is increasing staff's ability to determine whether the proposed stormwater management facility footprint depicted on a development plan or plat submitted at the zoning review stage is adequate to meet the detention, BMP and adequate outfall requirements. It is also anticipated that the active involvement of DPWES staff during the zoning process will facilitate increased applications of techniques generally associated with low impact development concepts and will ensure that opportunities for implementation of watershed management planning recommendations during the zoning process will, where appropriate, be identified and pursued.

Additionally, in order to further facilitate this effort, DPWES has developed a prestaffing rezoning application review checklist, in which even before the plan is staffed in DPZ, a consistent list of comments are assembled for discussion at DPZ staffing meetings. Topics such as pond size, adequate outfall, SWM general are addressed. Furthermore, LID options are explored for the site and suggested in a clear, concise method.

The Northern Virginia Soil and Water Conservation District (NVSWCD) also makes recommendations for protecting streams at the rezoning stage. Following a visit to each site proposed for a rezoning, NVSWCD staff provides DPZ with a comprehensive environmental evaluation for proposed land use change. The review takes into consideration the properties of soils, slopes, erosion potential, existing natural resources, and drainage. Particular attention is given to streams, stormwater management, and impacts that may result both on and off site. Recommendations are made, as appropriate, for better site design techniques, low impact development practices, and stormwater management measures that will lessen the impact. NVSWCD also works directly with developers to advise on ways to develop sites with less adverse impact on streams and other natural resources.

With respect to low impact development (LID) techniques, Fairfax County is moving ahead with a contract to develop specific LID techniques that can be incorporated into the Public Facilities Manual (PFM). The County is in the initial stages of developing the techniques--twenty-five practices with brief descriptions, illustrations, and functions will be presented to internal and external stakeholders; EQAC will be involved in this process. Finally, six practices will be selected to be developed and put into the PFM as an approved practice within Fairfax County.

In the past year, the Northern Virginia Soil and Water Conservation District (NVSWCD) conducted a feasibility study, and then developed a plan and prepared specific designs for incorporating numerous LID techniques into the stormwater management plan for the Lorton Workhouse Arts Center. The recommended practices include bioretention, porous pavers, underground detention and infiltration swales. Funded through a grant from the Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation (DCR), the project included the installation of a rain garden as an example of techniques that will be used throughout the 55 acre site. The excavation and heavy equipment work was done by the Maintenance and Stormwater Management Division (MSMD) of DPWES. DPWES-MSMD also partnered with NVSWCD to install another demonstration project at Yorktowne Square condominiums, where NVSWCD designed a rain garden to receive runoff from a parking lot and roof tops. In the Providence District, a project entitled "Demonstrating Innovation: A Stormwater Retrofit at the Providence Supervisor's Office" has been awarded a grant from DCR to retrofit a part of the parking lot with a rain garden, permeable pavers, and underground detention.. Also, a green roof will be installed on a small building next to the parking lot. NVSWCD, the Stormwater Planning Division (SWPD) of DPWES, and MSMD are partners in the design and installation of this project. The Tinner Hill Heritage site, located in Falls Church and Fairfax County, is being developed using LID concepts that are being designed by NVSWCD and DPWES-SWPD.

The Park Authority is exploring how to better incorporate LID practices in County parks as part of the Park Authority Natural Resource Management Plan approved by the Park Authority Board in January, 2004. In the first year implementation (FY 2005), the Park Authority is researching the options available and their costs and benefits. In addition, the Park Authority will be implementing an LID demonstration project funded by the Board of Supervisors with carryover funds dedicated to implementation of the Board's Environmental Agenda.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

Staff concurs with EQAC's recommendation.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

Watershed planning efforts should continue to be supported such that plans can be completed for all County watersheds.

Efforts to evaluate LID techniques for possible inclusion in the PFM should continue.

The Department of Planning and Zoning and the Department of Public Works and Environmental Services should coordinate on the development of a process through which stormwater management implications of Comprehensive Plan amendment proposals can be assessed by DPWES.

After some experience has been gained in the review of development proposals under the strengthened stormwater management submission requirements, DPZ and DPWES should coordinate to discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the new requirements and their implementation and to identify improvements in the interagency coordination process that may be needed.

LID feasibility studies and efforts to install demonstration projects should continue, and monitoring plans should be implemented in order to assess the effectiveness of demonstration projects. The administrative processes and current regulations with regard to the incorporation of LID practices onto site plans should be evaluated.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2006? If so, please explain.

Watershed management plans will continue to require funding. Funding as requested by DPWES in the FY 2006 budget submission should be supported.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

Yes. Development of the watershed management plans alone will cost approximately \$15 million. To date, \$7.8 million has been expended or encumbered for ongoing plans. A dedicated funding source should be developed to meet this critical need and implement the recommendations in each watershed. See response to recommendation #1 for additional information on a dedicated funding source for the county's Stormwater Management Program.

Response to 2004 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Water Resources #4

(Page III-101 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC continues to strongly support the full funding and implementation of the comprehensive countywide watershed management program.

Fairfax County's stream and other water resources are a legacy to preserve and protect for today's citizens and future generations. The well conceived and well-done countywide stream assessment report was released in January, 2001. This underlying scientific examination of existing stream conditions is being used to create a well-coordinated and well-planned effort to establish priorities to protect, restore, and monitor changes to these resources using watershed and sub-watershed based strategies. EQAC strongly endorses the ongoing work of the county Board and staff in the watershed planning efforts.

EQAC continues to support:

- Coordination of ongoing assessments of existing watersheds, to include point and non-point sources, including amounts of impervious surface and vegetative cover;
- Maintenance and inspection of county BMPs at the highest level;
- Provision of funding at a level that is adequate to create and implement a fully functional stream protection program;
- The coordination of all relevant water quality and stream data and data analysis from all sources within the DPWES Stream Protection Strategy and watershed planning program; and
- The granting of a minimum number of waivers and the authority given so that all waivers must be reviewed and either accepted or denied by the stormwater management program responsible for watershed planning (i.e., the Stormwater Planning Division of DPWES).

Lead agencies for this response: DPWES (SWPD & MSMD)

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: FCPA; DPWES (LDS)

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Laura Grape

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

This recommendation is being addressed.

A major aspect of this EQAC recommendation is currently being pursued by means of the Watershed Planning effort and comprehensive stream monitoring program. It is anticipated that

Water Resources #4

Continued

staff will develop watershed management plans for the county's watersheds by 2010, to assist in meeting the Chesapeake Bay 2000 Agreement's goal of completing watershed management plans in two-thirds of the Bay's watershed. County BMP's continue to be inspected and maintained at the levels provided for at existing funding levels. This corresponds to an annual inspection of County maintained facilities and a quinquennial inspection of privately maintained facilities. Maintenance is prioritized based on ensuring safety of the facilities; water quality and quantity measures are addressed with remaining funding.

Changes to the level of service to inspect and maintain the County's BMPs is currently being discussed through a Board-appointed Stormwater Advisory Committee. In addition, initial watershed plans for Little Hunting Creek and Popes Head Creek recommend increasing the frequency of inspection for privately maintained stormwater facilities to an annual frequency. Any changes to the level of service for inspection and maintenance will require additional resources.

The watershed planning effort includes an extensive review of existing data, reports, and documents, including:

1. 2001 Stream Protection Strategy Baseline Study report
2. 2003 Stream Physical Assessment
3. Annual Water Quality reports from the county Health Department

For the SPS study, land use and imperviousness levels of the contributing drainage areas for each of the 114 sampling sites was assessed based on the most recently available data.

During the Stream Physical Assessment, 820 miles of county stream were characterized to develop a complete inventory of the physical conditions of county streams. In addition to assessing in-stream characteristics, locations of potential non-point source pollutants (trash dumps, etc) and potential point sources (pipe crossings, illicit discharges, etc) were also identified. Deficient streamside buffer locations were also inventoried.

Through the Health Department's water quality monitoring program, 80 sites have been monitored for fecal coliform, phosphorous, nitrates, and other common parameters. This effort was assumed by DPWES in 2003.

Stream assessment data collected through county agencies and volunteer efforts will be incorporated into an annual report. These existing studies will be enhanced in the future through the comprehensive stream monitoring program which will provide a summary of the stream monitoring programs existing in Fairfax County, including:

- ❖ Targeted stream monitoring locations
 - Volunteer efforts (ANS and NVSWCD)
 - Project specific
- ❖ Probabilistic random stratified sampling data; and
- ❖ Wet and dry weather monitoring data – MS4 and VPDES permit

Volunteer stream monitors, sample approximately 50 sites under the coordination of NVSWCD's Volunteer Stream Monitoring program and six sites through the Audubon Naturalist Society's Water Quality Monitoring program, four times a year. The biological monitoring data, collected under a strict quality control program, provide on-going trend data and can alert to sudden or dramatic changes in water quality.

As the county moves towards a probabilistic sampling approach, randomly selecting stream segments based on certain parameters (i.e. stream order) to determine the overall quality of the county's streams, volunteer data will be relied upon as the source of on-going trend data. Staff is working closely with the volunteer program coordinators to ensure their data is included in future annual reports. The probabilistic approach will aid in meeting the Board of Supervisor's 20-year vision for Environmental Excellence.

Under the county's MS4 and VPDES permit, wet and dry weather monitoring is performed at numerous sites that are representative of the county's varying degrees of urbanization. This monitoring is performed in order to estimate countywide pollutant loads and detect illicit discharges. In May 2004, DPWES created a new job class of Ecologists to coordinate the ongoing biological stream monitoring programs in the county and assist in meeting the requirements of the MS4 permit. The advent of a dedicated funding source would ensure adequate resources are available to continue these monitoring and protection efforts and meet the requirements of the MS4 permit.

The Stormwater Planning Division currently reviews and provides recommendations to Land Development Services on detention (water quantity) waiver requests for development projects. SWPD reviews the requests for conformance with the current drainage master plan and advises LDS of any known downstream erosion and flooding concerns. Where feasible, Low Impact Development measures are recommended. As the watershed plans are completed, all detention waiver requests will be evaluated for conformance with the recommendations of watershed plans. Additionally, a review of the waiver process was conducted as part of the Regional Pond Task Force which has made several recommendations on how to address waivers in the future. SWPD will continue to provide technical assistance and advisory recommendations to LDS on detention waiver requests.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

This recommendation is in the process of being addressed. Please see above.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

The county should continue to fund the development and implementation of watershed management plans for all county watersheds. The county is to continue the consideration of different funding strategies to implement a dedicated funding source for supporting the operation of a comprehensive stormwater management program and implementation of the watershed plan recommendations.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2006? If so, please explain.

In order to continue the programs cited above, a dedicated funding source for the county's stormwater management program should be considered.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

Yes. Development of the watershed management plans alone will cost approximately \$15 million, of which \$7.5 million have been allocated or are encumbered, to date. A dedicated funding source is one way to meet this critical need and implement the recommendations in each watershed.

Response to 2004 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Water Resources #5

(Page III-101 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

This watershed protection and restoration program should also include the following:

- Equal importance should be devoted to environmental protection, restoration, and monitoring as compared to infrastructure improvement and maintenance.
- A Watershed Board should be established to oversee such a program and to ensure that the above conditions are met. While EQAC realizes that there is some concern about how such a board would function, EQAC feels that such a board would best be able to consider input from all stakeholders interested in watershed restoration and protection at the countywide policy level.
- This also should include structures and practices and a timely approval process that encourages bioretention and recharge to aquatic systems, and other innovative practices to be used in the county.

Lead agencies for this response: DPWES (SWPD)

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: DPWES (LDS)

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Laura Grape

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

This recommendation is partially addressed.

Through the Stormwater Needs Assessment Project, a stormwater utility fee has been recommended as a dedicated funding source for stormwater improvement projects. For more information concerning the fee, please see the response for EQAC's Water Resources #1 recommendation. As part of this project, a Stormwater Advisory Committee was formed, with representatives appointed by the members of the Board of Supervisors, to work collaboratively with the county and consultant team to look at the level and extent of service and provide recommendations for improvements to the Stormwater Management program. The committee is also recommending a dedicated funding source to finance improvements. The project team is preparing recommendations on how to allocate the fee, which will be presented before the members of the Board of Supervisors at their March 28, 2005 meeting.

Through the watershed planning effort, specific locations will be identified, also through the assistance of community advisory committees, to protect, stream banks and adjacent lands to restore, in addition to monitoring these locations to determine long-term conditions.

Both the Little Hunting Creek watershed plan and the draft Popes Head Creek watershed plans provide detailed recommendations for specific locations where innovative projects would be applicable. Among others, innovative projects include:

- retrofitting existing stormwater management facilities;
- installing bioretention facilities (including rain gardens and rain barrels); and
- applying Low Impact Development (LID) techniques.

The implementation of innovative techniques are expected to help the county reach its water quality goals while simultaneously handling the quantity of the water entering the county's streams and will be considered for every watershed in Fairfax County.

With the assistance of a private consultant, DPWES is developing recommendations to integrate LID practices, as appropriate, into the county's stormwater management program. The initial products of this effort will be a white paper on LID and its applicability to Fairfax County, a basic assessment/screening of LID technologies and practices, a detailed technology assessment and preparation of PFM amendments for a select subset of LID practices that may be used under current County policies and are compatible with standard engineering methods of analysis, and a final report with recommendations for future action. The project also includes meetings to solicit public input.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

Staff agrees that open communication with stakeholders is important to the success and approval of the watershed plans. There are currently numerous outlets for staff to communicate with community stakeholders, including the Fairfax Watershed Network, watershed public forums and existing Community Advisory Committees for each of the watershed plans.

In the long-term, these groups may be closely networked and serve a similar purpose as a Watershed Board to monitor the implementation of the watershed plans.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

The county should continue developing and implementing watershed management plans for all county watersheds. The county should also continue to develop options to implement a dedicated funding source, to implement watershed plans and for the operation of a sustaining and comprehensive stormwater management program.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2006? If so, please explain.

In order to continue the program cited above, a dedicated funding source for the county's stormwater management program should be considered.

In the County Executive's proposed FY 2006 budget to the members of the Board of Supervisors, one penny of the Real Estate Tax is recommended to be dedicated for the

Water Resources #5

Continued

stormwater management program. The total amount is \$17.9 million and includes three new staff positions. The funds are earmarked for accelerating the completion of watershed plan development, initiating watershed plan implementation, and initiating the rehabilitation of the stormwater infrastructure.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

Yes. Significant increased funding will be required to complete the development of the watershed planning effort and to implement the associated recommendations for each watershed. Implementation of the plans will be over the next 20 or more years and will require a significant and sustainable funding source to implement capital improvement projects. Now that the watershed planning initiative is underway, it is critical that a dedicated funding source be adopted in order to maintain this essential program.

Response to 2004 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Water Resources #6

(Page III-101 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC continues to recommend posting of county streams with a health warning for fecal coliform bacteria until such time that the county conducts a study as to the source of microbiological threats. EQAC recommends that the county initiate such a study within 12 months and subsequently implement a plan to address the sources of actual threats to public health.

County streams have continued to show high coliform bacteria counts. A Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) for coliform bacteria has been developed for Accotink Creek and Four Mile Run due to excessive coliform bacteria counts. The sources of the pollution have been identified and steps need to be taken to remediate the problem. Human coliform bacteria have been found to be present in significant amounts. Until such a time as remediation is made, EQAC recommends the posting of signs in county streams with high coliform bacteria counts and/or a broad public information campaign that contains the following from the 1999 Health Department report: *“The use of streams for contact recreational purpose, such as swimming, wading, etc. which could cause the ingestion of stream water or possible contamination of an open wound by stream water, should be avoided.”*

Lead agencies for this response: DPWES (SWPD)

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: Health

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Laura Grape

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

The bacteriological monitoring program was assumed by DPWES-Stormwater Planning Division in calendar year 2003. This program will continue to exist as part of the comprehensive biological monitoring program. A few changes will be made to the sampling regime to better coordinate the county's goal of a comprehensive approach to evaluating the water quality of its streams. Additionally, two techniques will be applied, to help identify location of potential human waste water inputs into the county's waterway. These include:

- Processing samples for Escherichia coli and enterococci bacteria concentrations, in addition to fecal coliform bacteria
- Applying optical brightener monitoring technique

In calendar year 2003, *E. coli* concentrations were monitored in addition to the levels of fecal coliform. This stems from the 1986 EPA document that first identifies the difficulties in analyzing for and detecting the many possible harmful pathogens or parasites that are found in our waterways. *E. coli* and enterococci bacteria are considered to have a higher degree of association with outbreaks of certain diseases than fecal coliforms and were recommended as the basis for bacterial water quality standards in the 1986 Ambient Water Quality Criteria for Bacteria document (both for fresh waters, enterococci for marine waters).

Historically, the county's bacteriological monitoring program analyzed only fecal coliform concentrations. Monitoring the levels of *E. coli* will allow the county to better judge the level of water quality impairment and associated health risks for the county's waterways and therefore, better protect its residents. Until an accurate way to compare the results of fecal coliform and *E. coli* is developed and tested, samples will be processed using both methodologies so that past fecal coliform results can be compared to more recent data.

Optical Brighteners Monitoring (OBM) is a technique used to identify potential illicit waste water discharges into the storm drainage network. Optical brighteners are found in most household and industrial laundry detergents and glow under a UV light. In calendar year 2004, an Environmental Protection Agency representative trained staff on OBM methods. To aid in narrowing down the area where potential cross-connections may be occurring, OBM techniques may be applied in the upper sections of the site's sub-watershed where streams regularly have bacteria concentrations well above the state standard.

As new information becomes available, locations that currently have information related to fecal coliform and recreational uses of streams will continue to be updated, including:

- The county's Web site
- The county's Kiosk system
- Annual water quality reports
- Existing semi-annual publications

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

Staff agrees that posting of streams is a viable form of notification of impaired waterways and potential health hazards. However, a strategic outreach plan should be explored to conserve resources and ensure effectiveness. Targeting areas with visible public access points to streams, including nature centers and stream valley kiosks should be considered a priority for posting notices. These locations also serve as excellent distribution points for any brochures that may be developed. This effort necessitates coordination between many county agencies to ensure that the message is arranged and delivered in an effective and efficient manner.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

Staff believes that a more established outreach program needs to be created in order to distribute this material countywide. Coordination among various county agencies, including DPWES,

Water Resources #6

Continued

Health Department, NVSWCD, OPA and others will ensure that materials, (i.e. brochures), will have a consistent message and a comprehensive scope.

DPWES is also in the process of creating a Web site to report the results of the bacteria monitoring.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2006? If so, please explain.

In order to continue the monitoring programs cited above, a dedicated funding source for the county's stormwater management program should be considered.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

Dedicated funding source should be considered to expand and continue with this program.

Response to 2004 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Water Resources #7

(Page III-101 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC is pleased to note the MS4 requirement to develop a long-term watershed monitoring program to verify the effectiveness and adequacy of stormwater management goals and identify areas of water quality improvement or degradations. EQAC further recommends a pilot program of monitoring or study on the effectiveness of stormwater detention facilities.

While the overall reports, the Health Department Report and the Stream Protection Strategy Baseline Study (DPWES), indicate that Fairfax County streams have degrees of degradation, the specific causes are unclear. In some cases such as Kingstowne, there is adequate monitoring, and remediation, when required, has occurred. In other cases, such as Lake Martin, citizens were placed in the unfortunate position of having to monitor and document the degradation due to failed or inadequate stormwater facilities and inadequate soil and erosion enforcement.

EQAC is, however, unclear as to which structures and requirements are effective and working well in what conditions in Fairfax County. The continued granting of stormwater waivers appears to contribute to degradation of streams despite claims to the contrary. Data should be collected.

Lead agencies for this response: DPWES (SWPD)

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: DPWES (LDS)

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Laura Grape

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

This recommendation is being partially addressed at this time.

While a pilot program for monitoring the effectiveness of ponds is not established, staff has managed the Kingstowne Environmental Monitoring Program since 1986. This program assists the county in evaluating the sediment removal efficiencies of erosion and sediment controls installed at the developing Kingstowne tract and provides data on nutrient and heavy metal loadings to Dogue Creek. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers permit required that the development of the South Van Dorn Street extension include the installation of a second station to evaluate nutrient loads from the entire Silver Springs segment of the Dogue Creek watershed. The second station was established in 2002. Results from this program have not been encouraging, as efficiency is below expectation.

Water Resources #7

Continued

Staff annually inspects county-maintained public ponds to perform regular maintenance and engineer solutions to address deficiencies, if necessary.

Locations of existing stormwater detention facilities that may require retrofitting are currently being identified through the Watershed Planning process. Retrofitting these facilities in these watersheds is intended to exceed the performance criteria or standards that were used for the original design of the facility. The increased performance and/or coverage area should improve water quality in the watershed.

Staff also oversees monitoring activities associated with ad hoc projects such as the bacteria source tracking study for the Accotink Creek TMDL study and the evaluation of reduction in pollutant loadings achieved by retrofitting flood control stormwater management facilities such as Reston 913.

Targeted biological monitoring of specific facilities and restoration sites is also being considered as part of the comprehensive program, to determine their effectiveness.

The county has specific policies in place for the granting of stormwater waivers. However, waivers are not granted where outfalls are known to be inadequate or shown to be inadequate through engineering computations. In special circumstances, staff does in fact conduct an evaluation of stream conditions where a waiver is requested, and uses these findings in making recommendations on a waiver request. It is felt that utilizing knowledge from existing research and studies on BMPs and the on-going biological monitoring conducted by SWPD will provide the most cost-effective means of detecting and highlighting changes in stream conditions on a countywide basis.

It is noted that the current adequate outfall requirements are under review in response to recommendation SW-12 of the Infill and Residential Development Study. Preliminary recommendations have been provided to the Board and EQAC to clarify the extent of downstream review required and to require an evaluation of the erosion potential of increases in the volume and duration of flow in addition to the current evaluation of erosion potential for the peak discharge. Also, in response to SW-12, the current detention requirements are being reviewed in conjunction with the review of the adequate outfall requirements. When implemented, the proposed changes to the adequate outfall requirements and any changes to the detention requirements that may be recommended should reduce the incidence of stream erosion in the county.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

While a comprehensive countywide program to monitor the effectiveness of stormwater management ponds and BMPs would be desirable, it would be cost-prohibitive. For example, the installation and maintenance of a single automated water quality monitoring station costs on the magnitude of \$80,000+ per year. It would be resource intensive to resolve concerns with

Water Resources #7

Continued

existing models predicting loading factors that impact removal efficiencies. Currently, DPWES does not have the resources required to accurately address this problem.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

Complete the ongoing review of the adequate outfall and detention requirements under SW-12 and incorporate the final recommendations into the PFM.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2006? If so, please explain.

In order to continue the programs cited above, a dedicated funding source for the county's stormwater management program should be considered.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

To implement a countywide program of inspecting the effectiveness of county stormwater facilities would require significant increases in funding and staff resources. A dedicated funding source should be considered to assist DPWES in performing proactive measures to analyzing their current stormwater facilities and implement solutions to improve those that are not removing the established water quality and/or quantity requirements.

Response to 2004 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Solid Waste #1, #2, and #3

(Page 130 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC was asked to review the 20-year Solid Waste Management Plan (SWMP) developed by the county staff for submission to Virginia Department of Environmental Quality (VDEQ). EQAC enthusiastically supports all of the recommendations in the 20-year SWMP (see the EQAC resolution to the Board of Supervisors from April, 2004 [Appendix A]). After the public hearing regarding these recommendations, a Solid Waste Management Plan Task Force (SWMPTF) was formed which has been tasked with refining and supplementing the recommendations set forth by the county staff in the 20-year plan. EQAC is a member of the county's Solid Waste Management Plan Task Force (SWMPTF) and EQAC eagerly awaits the report of the task force, due out mid 2005.

EQAC continues to support efforts to remove waste from the solid waste stream through recycling, however, there is room for improvement. EQAC recommends the following:

- The county should continue to work with the solid waste hauler community to increase curbside recycling to include multiuse paper and plastic in addition to the items already being collected for recycling.
- The county should develop policies that change the recycling requirement for office buildings such that the requirement will apply to office buildings with more than 100 full time employees (FTEs)—the requirement now applies only to office buildings with more than 200 FTEs.
- The county should develop policies that change the recycling requirement for commercial business centers (CBCs, or strip malls) such that the requirement will apply to CBCs that generate more than 50 tons per year of solid waste—the requirement now applies only to CBCs that generate more than 100 tons per year.

Lead agencies for this response: DPWES (SWC&RD)

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: DPWES (SWD&RRD)

Please identify a lead agency contact person:

Pamela Gratton, Division of Solid Waste Collection and Recycling
703-324-5498

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

The Solid Waste Management Program for Fairfax County is in the process of implementing this EQAC recommendation. The new 20-year Solid Waste Management Plan for the county recommended the curbside source separation of certain recyclables for collection countywide. The recommendation was to expand the curbside collection of recyclables to include mixed paper, flattened cardboard and plastic bottles and jugs. These materials would be source separated from trash at residences throughout Fairfax County for curbside collection and ultimate delivery to a recycling facility. The Recycling Program Requirements will be modified to include these additional recyclables as materials that must be recycled from residences in the county.

The recommendation to add new recyclables to be collected curbside was presented to the Solid Waste Task Force (SWTF), at their November 30, 2004 meeting. At that meeting, two issues regarding recycling were discussed and then approved. The SWTF voted to approve the curbside collection of residential mixed paper, flattened cardboard and plastic bottles and jugs throughout the county. The second issue resolved at that meeting was that the public outreach program to educate citizens about implementing the curbside changes would be developed and produced by the county. The privately-owned refuse and recycling collection companies operating in the county will help educate citizens about the change by distributing educational literature to their customers. During discussions by the SWTF, it was recommended that all materials be added at the same time to allow for a single education campaign to residential customers. Program implementation will begin during calendar year 2005, and staff notified the solid waste collection firms at the January 2005 meeting that we desire voluntary compliance by July 2005. Staff have already prepared a draft implementation plan and are proceeding to implement the collection of additional recyclables curbside countywide.

Response to Recommendations IV 2 and 3

The new 20-year Solid Waste Management Plan for the county recommended that additional businesses be required to recycle beyond those currently required to recycle. The EQAC recommendation was to reduce the thresholds currently in place whereby certain businesses are required to recycle. The existing thresholds where businesses are required to recycle in Fairfax County include:

- Office buildings with more than 200 full-time employees (FTEs); and
- Commercial business centers (such as strip malls) that generate more than 100 tons of refuse per year.

EQAC recommends that these thresholds be reduced to the following:

- Office buildings with more than 100 full-time employees (FTEs); and
- Commercial business centers (such as strip malls) that generate more than 50 tons of refuse per year.

Solid Waste #1, #2 & #3

Continued

EQAC's recommendation is consistent in concept with the SWMP, however, the thresholds eventually established may be greater or lower than suggested. Staff will be developing the new business recycling requirements in consultation with businesses in Fairfax County, and we are currently working on the various aspects of that task. The basic goals of that program will incorporate the following:

- Increase the quantity of traditional recyclables collected from businesses (paper, cardboard, etc.);
- Provide opportunities to recycle construction and demolition debris; and
- Increase the quantity of electronics, fluorescent light tubes and rechargeable batteries recycled to reduce the introduction of constituents of concern into the county's waste management system.

The preliminary plan to implement improvements in business recycling is described below:

- i. Identify organizations and groups that represent the major businesses generating waste and recyclables in the county.
- ii. After these organizations are identified, invite them to participate in meetings to help develop recycling improvements.
- iii. Create public outreach approach to educate businesses about recommendations to include: seminars, print media, outreach through business associations (including the Chamber of Commerce), websites and any other tools available for which resources exist.
- iv. Make any necessary changes to Chapter 109 of the Code of the County of Fairfax and other technical guidance documents.
- v. Provide technical assistance to businesses.
- vi. Improve business data collection activities to measure recycling improvements and pollution prevention activities so that this information can be reported back to the community.

After these steps are completed, recommendations to improve business recycling will be implemented.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

Recommendation is in process.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

Staff is currently working toward this recommendation.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2006? If so, please explain.

The plan to require the source separation of mixed paper, flattened cardboard and plastic bottles and jugs for collection curbside for recycling has been anticipated due to the planning effort undertaken as part of the county's new (2004) 20-year Solid Waste Management Plan. Budgets were estimated and proposed for implementation of the solid waste management plan for the county's 2006 budget that should be approved by the Board of Supervisors in April 2005. Staff anticipates that this budget will be approved, which will support the funding of a public outreach and education campaign about the change to the recycling system in the county.

With respect to budgeting for the business recycling improvements, this is a multi-year effort that will be budgeted for and implemented as funding and staffing will allow. Staff expects that funding and necessary staff resources will be available.

In FY 2005, the Board of Supervisors allotted additional funding to the Solid Waste Management Program for business recycling support, as well as implementing a pollution prevention program. The proposed business recycling improvement plan includes a pollution prevention component as a portion of the overall program. This additional funding will assist the county in achieving improvements in recycling from the business community.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

The public education component of the business recycling programs in the county is anticipated to be supported in county solid waste initiatives. Since the county completed the new 20-year Solid Waste Management Plan, funding priorities have been clearly identified and are budgeted in the county's annual budget process. Staff will continue to find ways to maximize allocated funding by continuing to partner with community and business organizations and exploring all opportunities for working cooperatively with other local jurisdictions.

Response to 2004 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Hazardous Materials #1

(Page 142 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC continues to recommend an aggressive public education campaign on how to properly dispose of household/residential, commercial, and industrial hazardous waste. Continuous partnering with the Northern Virginia Board of Realtors and solid waste haulers to distribute information to all new residents in the county is suggested. New residents would be anybody buying or renting a house, townhouse, or condominium. Creative use of other organizations is also encouraged.

Lead agencies for this response: DPWES (SWD&RRD)

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: OPA & DPWES (SWC&R)

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Amarjit Riat, Division of Solid Waste Disposal and Resource Recovery. 703-690-7269

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

EQAC recommends that staff continue an aggressive public education campaign on how to properly dispose of household/residential, commercial, and industrial hazardous waste. This request contains two separate and distinct components: an outreach campaign for hazardous waste generated by residents and an outreach campaign for commercial and industrial hazardous waste. Hazardous waste generated by residents in households is defined as household hazardous waste (HHW) by both federal and state environmental regulations. Hazardous wastes generated by businesses are defined separately in the regulations and are regulated differently when compared to HHW. Therefore, this discussion addresses each type of waste separately.

Household Hazardous Waste

County staff will continue to educate county residents about the proper disposal of HHW.

County staff continues to work with the Government Affairs Committee for the Northern Virginia Association of Realtors (NVAR). The county's flyer about proper handling of household hazardous waste was printed in their monthly magazine in the March 2004 for the first time and will be reprinted from time to time. This magazine is distributed to its 7,500 members. In addition NVAR will provide a link from their Web site to the County's Web site.

News to Use, a monthly e-mail newsletter distributed by the Office of Public Affairs, periodically offers information about household hazardous materials disposal at the Citizens Disposal Facilities located at the I-66 Transfer Station and the I-95 Complex. Brochures and

Hazardous Materials #1

Continued

materials are available at community events such as EarthDay/Arbor Day, Celebrate Fairfax, Fall for Fairfax and other events sponsored throughout the county during the year.

With respect to the request to use the solid waste collectors to distribute this information, this has been requested through the monthly newsletters staff sends to the solid waste collectors. Staff will also request their assistance through the Solid Waste Task Force currently convened, and during the quarterly collection company meetings.

Staff has also undertaken an update of the county's solid waste management information on the Fairfax County website. This program is underway and has the purpose of making the information easier to find on the website while ensuring that the most accurate and up-to-date information is available. This website update has also prompted a critical review of published brochures on the subject and resulted in several improvements to this educational material.

Business Hazardous Waste

Communicating hazardous waste management requirements to businesses is much more involved since the regulations for the proper and legal management of these materials are more complicated and carry both civil and criminal penalties if violated. Staff has recognized this distinction and has included a business hazardous waste management outreach component as one of the goals of the business recycling improvement program presented previously. The goal of this outreach campaign is to educate businesses that rely on electronics to conduct their operations that many of the products they use daily are defined and classified as hazardous waste when they are disposed of when they are no longer useful.

The vast majority of businesses in the county are service-sector oriented operations that rely on the use of personal computers and equipment with rechargeable batteries (such as cell phones and laptops) in buildings lit with fluorescent lamps. Staff desires to educate the businesses that do not recognize themselves as generators of hazardous waste about their responsibility to comply with applicable state and federal hazardous waste management regulations. To this end, staff has completed several initial activities to educate businesses about their responsibility in the proper and legal management of hazardous waste including the following items.

RecycleWorks, a newsletter to businesses from the county's solid waste management program, was sent to all businesses required by county code to prepare an annual recycling rate report. This newsletter included articles about recycling electronics and rechargeable batteries as well as fluorescent lamps.

The Fluorescent Lamp recycling program was started by the county's Facilities Management Division (FMD) to recycle spent fluorescent lamps generated in county-owned buildings and was recently honored by the Board of Supervisors. This program has been the subject of press releases, radio news interviews and was included as an article in *RecycleWorks* as well as the county's new recycling e-newsletter, *Fairfax Recycler*.

The Board of Supervisors, at its January 10th meeting, commended FMD for its initiative in creating and implementing the Fluorescent Lamp recycling program and asked the Office of Public Affairs to continue to publicize this activity in an effort to suggest that businesses in the county follow our example. To that end, a press release was sent to all Fairfax County chambers of commerce to ask them to distribute this important information to county businesses.

The County also offers scheduled events that allow business who are conditionally exempt small quantity generators of hazardous waste to properly dispose of the waste at a county location.

Three Conditionally Exempt Small Quantity Generator (CESQG) events were held in 2004 and three more are planned throughout 2005. These events allow businesses that generate small amounts of hazardous materials to properly dispose of the materials in a cost effective manner. Businesses pay the County a fee to dispose of the materials with contractors who properly handle the hazardous materials such as flammable liquids, herbicides, corrosives, poisons, oil base paint, inks and others. The 2005 events will be held April 13th, July 27th and October 5th, all at the 1-66 Solid Waste Complex at 4816 West Ox Road.

News releases will be prepared for all events and distributed to the media, posted on the County's Web site and included in NewsLink, the daily e-mail newsletter for county employees. A brochure has been developed for the CESQG program and is available to businesses in print and on the website.

The Fairfax Chamber of Commerce has agreed to help publicize the CESQG events.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

This recommendation is being addressed.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

The plan is being implemented as discussed above.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2006? If so, please explain.

Staff anticipates that the budget requirements associated with the solid waste initiatives of the SWMP will be approved, which will support the funding of this program. This is a multi-year effort that will be budgeted for and implemented as funding and staffing will allow. Staff expects that funding and necessary staff resources will be available.

Hazardous Materials #1

Continued

NOTE: The requested funding described is for public outreach only and does not include any additional funding for covering the costs of the actual management of the business hazardous wastes at county-operated facilities. Typically, businesses have paid for the cost of the material disposal.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

The public education component of this program is anticipated to be supported in county solid waste initiatives. Since the county completed the new 20-year solid waste management plan, funding priorities have been clearly identified and are budgeted in the county's annual budget process. Staff will continue to find ways to maximize allocated funding by partnering with community and business organizations and exploring all opportunities for working cooperatively with other local jurisdictions.

Response to 2004 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Hazardous Materials #2

(Page 142 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

The county should institute the recycling of NiCad batteries at the I-66 transfer station, the I-95 SW site, and other sites. With the growing popularity and use of rechargeable batteries products, especially cell phones, EQAC recommends an aggressive program to promote recycling of NiCad batteries. Commercial efforts should continue and even expand. Schools and other organizations should be encouraged to come up with creative initiative to promote significant increases in recycling rechargeable batteries.

Lead agencies for this response: DPWES (SWC&RD)

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: DPWES (SWD&RRD)

Please identify a lead agency contact person:

Jeffrey Smithberger, DPWES, Division of Solid Waste Collection and Recycling. 703-324-5230

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

Fairfax County will accept rechargeable batteries from residents at the HHW facilities located at both the I-66 and I-95 solid waste complexes. Additionally, conditionally exempt businesses can bring these materials to our events that are held periodically throughout the year. Therefore, this portion of the EQAC recommendation has already been implemented.

With respect to promoting rechargeable battery recycling programs for businesses, staff from the solid waste management program are working on a program that would strengthen outreach regarding this issue. As addressed in HM #1, the county wants to encourage responsible management of all hazardous waste generated by businesses by using the approaches and activities described in the previously-detailed programs as well as the 20-year Solid Waste Management Plan.

We will continue to address business hazardous waste management through a coordinated effort in partnership with businesses in the county, working to make the process easier for businesses.

One of the partnerships anticipated is by promoting the use of the Rechargeable Battery Recycling Corporation (RBRC, www.rbrc.com) by businesses in the county. Businesses can collect rechargeable batteries and ship them to a permitted battery management facility under programs managed by the RBRC for a very reasonable fee and sometimes at no cost.

Hazardous Materials #2

Continued

We will continue to strengthen our relationship with the FCPS teachers and other staff, to get recycling information into the schools. We also partner with several schools to sponsor Recycling Roadshows where recycling events are conducted on school properties using school volunteers. The events can be used to collect rechargeable batteries.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

Not applicable

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

County staff will continue to develop the rechargeable battery recycling program in conjunction with businesses and schools. Rechargeable batteries will continue to be collected from residents at the county's HHW facilities at our solid waste management complexes.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2006? If so, please explain.

This recommendation has been addressed in the response Hazardous Waste Recommendation 1.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

This recommendation has been addressed in the response to Hazardous Waste Recommendation 1.

Response to 2004 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Hazardous Materials #3

(Page 142 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

Efforts to locate financing to cover the printing cost of Hazardous Waste and Environmental Crime Materials should continue as new sources of grants and funding may become available.

Lead agencies for this response: Fire & Rescue

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: Emergency Management Coordinator: OPA; DPWES (SWPD)

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Captain I, William Garrett

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

The Fire & Rescue Department is working to obtain financing to cover the cost of Hazardous Waste and Environmental Crimes Materials through the Local Emergency Planning Committee (LEPC), within the Hazardous Materials Investigative Services Branch of our Department; however, the Deputy Coordinator of the Office of Emergency Management explained that there may be available funding for the purpose of covering the cost of such materials. .

The Stormwater Planning Division agrees with this recommendation and is willing to work collaboratively with other county agencies to develop outreach materials. SWPD believes that this would be a worth while effort as dumping of hazardous materials, including oil, paint, fertilizers, etc into the storm drain network is one of the leading causes of limited recreational use of the county's waterways.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

Opportunities for funding the Hazardous Waste and Environmental Crimes materials should be pursued through the Office of Emergency Management. These materials should be presented in at least a bi-lingual format.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2006? If so, please explain.

Neither the Fire & Rescue Department nor the FJLEPC have the budgetary resources to develop, print and market the programs/educational materials. In fact, the FJLEPC relies on donations from local businesses to print its brochures regarding proper notification procedures for hazardous materials releases.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range implications? If so, please explain.

Yes, the source of available funding will need to be relied upon annually to cover the cost for materials.

Response to 2004 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Hazardous Materials #4

(Page 143 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC recommends continuing to advertise and educate the public regarding the types of hazardous materials and other environmental situations citizens are requested to report, including who they are to contact. Possible avenues are community association newsletters, press release stories to the media, and age appropriate material sent home through the schools.

Lead agencies for this response: Fire and Rescue

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: FCPS

Lead agency for this response: Fire & Rescue Department

Coordinating agency for this response: FCPS

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Captain I, William Garrett

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

The Fire & Rescue Department agrees with this recommendation and will continue to work through our Public Information Officer (PIO), and the Office of Public Affairs (OPA) to advertise and educate the public regarding the types of hazardous materials and other environmental situations citizens are requested to report.

The Fire & Rescue Department, OPA and the Fairfax Joint Local Emergency Planning Committee (FJLEPC) have worked together for many years to develop educational materials regarding reporting hazardous materials releases in the County. These groups have also identified the need for educational materials to be translated into the core languages, especially concerning the release of hazardous materials. The FRD, OPA and FJLEPC continue to work together to develop avenues to disseminate information to the citizens of the County. This includes developing a comprehensive web site for the FJLEPC where newsletters and articles will be made available in PDF format for associations to send to their membership.

The FJLEPC and the staff of the Hazardous Materials and Investigative Services Section of the Fire & Rescue Department also attend Community events, such as the Fairfax Fair and Fall for Fairfax, where they set up displays and interact with the citizens. The educational materials for these events are usually reproduced from items available from the Environmental Protection

Agency and other government entities where materials can be received/reproduced for little or not cost and targets parents and their children.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

The Fire & Rescue Department, OPA and the FJLEPC will continue to work together to develop avenues for disseminating educational materials regarding the release of hazardous materials, proper disposal of household hazardous waste, and chemical emergency planning. However, resources are very limited and, historically, most of the cost have been solely borne by the FRD (Fire Prevention Division Cost Center) in developing and distributing these materials. Recent budget cuts have resulted in greatly curtailing the efforts to develop additional programs and have caused efforts to focus on maintaining what is currently in place.

There is limited funding available to support the efforts of the FJLEPC in developing and maintaining their web site. A small donation has been the sole source of funding available in support of their efforts. Thus far, the donation has enabled the FJLEPC to pay for web hosting services and domain name registration. The FJLEPC's current web page was designed by a high school student as a community service project; however, the committee would like to develop a more informative website. The Fire & Rescue Department does not have staffing or resources to be able to support the FJLEPC in this endeavor outside developing web content. It is recommended that the County provide funding so the FJLEPC can contract with a webpage developer to develop a professional, informative, and more interactive website where information can easily be disseminated through the use of PDF documents.

An addition hindrance to fully developing educational programs of this type is that the staff position currently assigned as liaison to the FJLEPC and developing educational outreach programs for hazardous materials is an exempt limited term position. Funding this position as merit status would allow the FRD to attract and retain individuals who have experience in marketing and/or emergency preparedness planning to develop the materials necessary for such an extensive outreach program. Merit status gains four weeks of work time each year, allowing for program continuity because the incumbent would not be required to take an annual 4-week break in service.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY2006? If, so, please explain.

Neither the Fire & Rescue Department nor the FJLEPC have the budgetary resources to develop, print and market the programs/educational materials that have been identified as a need. In fact, the FJLEPC relies on donations from local businesses to print its brochures regarding proper notification procedures for hazardous materials releases. It would cost approximately \$700 per core language to translate this one brochure, and an additional \$2,000 in printing services (for black/white print only) to print the core language brochures. These costs would be most likely be incurred for each brochure that is developed or revised.

Hazardous Materials #4

Continued

There is additional implication for personnel services if the limited term position is converted to merit status (Management Analyst II, S24). A merit Management Analyst II (S24) mid-point is \$59,798.13 (FY05), plus \$15,960.12 (26.69%) in fringe benefits. This cost would be off-set by a reduction in limited term salaries of \$40,000.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

Conversion of the limited term position would result in additional need of Character 20 funding over each subsequent fiscal year due to changes in fringe benefit packages and Pay for Performance Awards. Operational needs for printing and translation services are expected to remain steady due to the need of re-printing/revising of educational materials.

Response to 2004 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Ecological Resources #1

(Pages 179-180 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC recommends that the county Board of Supervisors develop and implement a countywide Natural Resource Management Plan – an ecological resources management plan that can be implemented through the policy and administrative branches of the county government structure. Two necessary tasks should be accomplished first -- prepare and adopt a unified Natural Resource Conservation Policy, and complete a countywide Baseline Natural Resource Inventory. This is a continuing recommendation from past years. EQAC notes that slow progress is being made in this area due to efforts by the Fairfax County Park Authority staff in their efforts to establish a natural resources baseline inventory. The FCPA has developed a countywide Green Infrastructure Map that appears a basis for a Natural Resource Inventory. Additionally, the Urban Forestry Division is continuing efforts to devise a countywide map for use as a layer on the county's GIS that will delineate the distribution of naturally occurring and landscaped vegetation. However, these efforts must be supplemented by an inventory of the county that accounts for flora and fauna. The Park Authority has now prepared a Natural Resources Plan for management of the county's parks. EQAC fully supports these efforts, urging that they culminate in a countywide Resource Management Plan. EQAC also notes the accomplishment of the Park Authority in preparing and publishing a Natural Resources Plan for management of the county's parks and urges the Park Authority to fully implement this plan. This is a continuing recommendation for past EQAC reports. EQAC's intent is that Fairfax County should have all the tools in place (the policy and the data) to create a plan that will support the active management and conservation of the county's natural resources.

Lead agencies for this response: DPZ

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: FCPA; DPWES (Urban Forest Management, SWPD)

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Noel Kaplan

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

Several ongoing efforts support this recommendation. Of particular note is progress on a comprehensive survey and mapping of vegetation ecosystems that occur in Fairfax County, Prince William County, Arlington County, the City of Alexandria, and other associated towns and cities. The mapping effort is applying the National Vegetation Classification System

Ecological Resources #1

Continued

(NVCS) in its identification of plant communities. In 2004, the Urban Forest Management (UFM) section of the Department of Public Works and Environmental Services (DPWES) continued collecting vegetation plot data in an effort to complete the total number of surveys needed to map the extents of natural plant communities in the multi-jurisdictional study area. UFM consulted with staff from the Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation (DCR) in an attempt to draw on vegetation data previously collected in Northern Virginia for Virginia Natural Communities Classification (VNCC) projects, especially survey data collected in or adjacent to the Potomac River Gorge. DCR committed to preparing a comprehensive list of the VNCC vegetation communities known to exist in Fairfax County. With the assistance of DCR, UFM will use this information to generate a list of corresponding NVCS vegetation communities. These data should greatly assist UFM staff to speed up the mapping process, and to recognize the many nuances encountered at the alliance and association levels of NVCS community types. Under advice of DCR, UFM modified older units of measurements and plot coverage gradients to reflect the most recent data vegetation collection methodologies used by NatureServe, Inc. and DCR. This will help ensure that the data collected by UFM will be useful to groups external to Fairfax County. In 2004, UFM completed the sufficient number of survey plots to begin comprehensive mapping of Fairfax County vegetation, and anticipates entering into a collaborative data collection arrangement with Arlington County in 2005. In 2005, UFM staff will concentrate on converting field datasets into usable Geographic Information System datasets and maps.

The Fairfax County Park Authority's (FCPA's) Natural Resource Management Plan (NRMP), which was adopted by the Park Authority Board in January, 2004, emphasizes the need for baseline inventories of flora and fauna in county parks. As FCPA implements the NRMP, it will be evaluating methods to add to and improve upon data already available and to determine the most effective way to leverage resources to get the best possible information on FCPA's land holdings (consisting of over 23,000 acres of land). FCPA and UFM are coordinating on how their respective efforts can complement and augment one another; the two entities will continue to coordinate on these efforts, and the collective experience of these two entities should prove helpful in developing a county-wide inventory. In addition, the Park Authority's experience in developing an Agency wide NRMP should prove helpful in an effort to develop a countywide plan.

In terms of implementing the Park Authority Natural Resource Management Plan, FCPA has identified an annual need of over \$2 million to implement the plan. FCPA continues to seek funding through the budget process and has been successful in including a significant amount of funding (\$1.3 million for cultural and natural resources protection and preservation and \$1.0 million for stream stabilization) in the 2004 Park Bond. FCPA also received support as part of the carryover funding the Board of Supervisors designated for projects related to the Environmental Agenda (funding was allocated for Geographic Information Systems, Stewardship Education, and Low Impact Development Demonstration projects).

Another effort related to natural resource management planning is the development of watershed management plans for all thirty of the county's watersheds. These watershed management plans are focusing on the ecological values of the county's aquatic habitats and are identifying a

Ecological Resources #1

Continued

comprehensive suite of efforts necessary to protect those aquatic resources with high ecological value and to restore those resources that have been degraded. The Watershed Management Plan for Little Hunting Creek has been completed, the plan for Popes Head Creek is nearing completion, and plans in several other watersheds are progressing.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

Staff concurs with EQAC's recommendation.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

The efforts noted above should continue. The Park Authority Natural Resource Management Plan requires significant funding to be fully implemented (over \$2 million per year needed). Interagency coordination should be strengthened in order to monitor and to openly communicate the progress of individual agency efforts to determine how they may be consolidated to serve as a foundation for the larger effort recommended by EQAC.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2006? If so, please explain.

Watershed management plans will continue to require funding. Funding as requested by DPWES in the FY 2006 budget submission should be supported.

No additional FY 2006 funding will be requested to support the NVCS vegetation mapping project, as the project is proceeding through grant funding.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

The Park Authority NRMP requires significant funding (over \$2 million needed annually to be fully implemented).

Additional resource needs may be identified in the future. It should be anticipated that significant resources would be needed to support the development, implementation, and continued maintenance of a Natural Resource Management Plan.

The total cost of completing watershed management plans is estimated to be \$15 million. To date, \$7.5 million has been expended or encumbered for ongoing plans. Costs for implementing recommendations of watershed management plans will be considerably greater; implementation costs for the Little Hunting Creek Watershed Management Plan alone are estimated to be \$30.4 million. In order to continue the watershed planning effort noted above, a dedicated funding source for the county's stormwater management program should be considered.

Response to 2004 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Ecological Resources #2

(Page 180 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

In past Annual Reports, EQAC recommended that the county Board of Supervisors emphasize public-private partnerships that use private actions such as purchase of land and easement by existing or new land trusts to protect forests and other natural resources, including champion/historic trees. With the signing of a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the Board of Supervisors and the Northern Virginia Conservation Trust, such a public-private partnership came into being. Thus, EQAC's recommendation has been satisfied. EQAC continues to commend the Board of Supervisors for this action and recommends continued support for this partnership. EQAC notes that the MOU is for a three-year period and therefore recommends continuing this MOU past the initial three years.

Lead agencies for this response: DPZ

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: FCPA; NVCT

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Alison F. Kriviskey, Planner III, DPZ

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

Funding was appropriated to the Northern Virginia Conservation Trust (NVCT) for FY 05 for \$250,602. Funding proposed for NVCT for FY 2006 is \$258,120; funding by the Board of Supervisors this coming year will mark the fifth consecutive year that the County has funded the NVCT.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

The Department of Planning and Zoning supports contributory agency status for NVCT. No further action is required. The Board of Supervisors will determine on a year-to-year basis the funding that can be allocated to NVCT.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

Staff believes that no further action is required.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2006? If so, please explain.

If the Board of Supervisors decides to fund NVCT as recommended by the County Executive, the FY 2006 cost would be \$258,120.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

If the Board of Supervisors approves funding for NVCT for FY 2006, there would be no commitment for the following year; however, depending upon performance of NVCT and the County's ability to fund it, it would appear that the amount funded this year would or could be replicated in future years.

Response to 2004 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Ecological Resources #3

(Page 180 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

In reaction to the limited tree preservation authority provided by the County Code, and recommendations by the Tree Preservation Task Force, Fairfax County initiated a proposal to amend the Virginia State Code § 15.2-961, as part of its 2002 strong emphasis on tree preservation. Two bills were introduced in the 2002 Virginia State Legislative Assembly, but were tabled until the 2003 session due to opposition by the Virginia Building Association. However, this proposal lost its active status in early 2003. While components of the proposed language survived in other legislative proposals adopted by the Virginia General Assembly in 2003, the newly adopted language is primarily focused on tree replacement. EQAC recommends that the Board of Supervisors continue to support the proposals to amend the Virginia State Code § 15.2-961 by placing greater emphasis on preservation of existing trees.

Lead agencies for this response: DPWES (Urban Forest Management)

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: None

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Michael Knapp

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

This recommendation has already been addressed.

Staff concurs that the County should continue to pursue new tree preservation legislation or amendments to existing Virginia State Code § 15.2-961 at the Virginia General Assembly.

Since Fairfax County's local ordinance is taking full advantage of Virginia State Code relating to tree preservation, attempts to strengthen local tree preservation and tree cover requirements must be preceded by new enabling language. In reaction to the current limitations of the State Code, Fairfax County has attempted to increase its local tree preservation authority by seeking amendments to the tree cover provisions of § 15.2-961. The recent legislative attempts to increase local authority are:

- **2002:** Fairfax County initiated a proposal to amend State Code § 15.2-961 as part of its 2002 Legislative Program. Senate Bill 484 and House Bill 105 were submitted by Fairfax and Prince William Counties as proposals to change the core concept of § 15.2-961 from tree replacement to tree conservation, with a strong emphasis on tree preservation. Both bills were introduced in the 2002 Virginia State Legislative

Assembly, but were tabled until the 2003 session due to opposition by the Virginia Building Association.

- **2003:** SB484 and HB105 were later terminated as viable legislation due to a Virginia State Legislative Assembly funding crisis.
- **2004:** Staff from the Department of Public Works and Environmental Services forwarded proposed amendments to State Code § 15.2-961 to the Board of Supervisors (the Board) Legislative Committee. The Board has been supportive of these proposed amendments; but, there has been substantial opposition in the Virginia Legislative Assembly. Based upon this opposition and an unwillingness by local Virginia State policy makers to patronize a similar proposal adopted in the previous Legislative Program, the Board's Legislative Committee chose not to include the proposal in the 2004 Legislative Program.
- **2004:** Local Virginia State Delegate Mark D. Sickles (House District 43) patronized HB1479, which proposed the same tree preservation amendments originally contained in SB484. On January 23, 2004, HB1479 was referred to the Committee on Counties, Cities and Towns; however, on February 11, 2004 the Committee voted to continue the bill to the 2005 Legislative Assembly.
- **2005:** The 2005 Fairfax County Legislative Program contains two tree-related matters: a legislative position supporting HB1479 which is a proposal to amend § 15.2-961 so that the existing tree cover requirements place higher emphasis on tree preservation; and, a proposed resolution concerning the use of tree preservation and planting measures in Virginia's air quality management plan. Unfortunately, HB1479 (tree preservation) died in the Counties, Cities, and Towns Committee. SJ343 (use of tree preservation and planting measures in Virginia's air quality management plan) died in Rules Committee.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

N/A

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

N/A

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2006? If so, please explain.

None

Ecological Resources #3
Continued

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain

None

Response to 2004 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Ecological Resources #4

(Page 180-181 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

Fairfax County no longer has Soil Science expertise on the county Staff. EQAC has in the past recommended that the Board of Supervisors reestablish this expertise. The Board of Supervisors did not establish staff positions in response to this EQAC recommendation; however, they did provide funding to the Northern Virginia Soil and Water Conservation District (NVSWCD) for mapping of the county's soils. This enabled NVSWCD to provide the needed expertise. There is, however, a continuing need for this expertise in the county. The recent incident on Telegraph Road, where a hillside slid into Telegraph Road and endangered homes at the crest of the hill, point out the soils problems that exist in the county. The increasing urbanization of the county has created new types of soils – urban man-made soils. These soils can have different characteristics in water infiltration and erosion. Therefore, as various projects are started in these soils, including stream restoration and other water control measures, expertise in these soils are needed in the county. At present, the only place this expertise exists is in NVSWCD. EQAC therefore recommends that the Board of Supervisors continue the agreement with NVSWD to provide soil scientist expertise.

Lead agency for this response: NVSWCD

Coordinating agencies for this response: DIT, DPWES-LDS, DPWES-MSMD, DPWES-SWPD

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Diane Hoffman

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

This recommendation has not yet been addressed. The soil scientist position in the NVSWCD will be funded through June 2007. The comments and concerns expressed by EQAC in the background information for this recommendation have been discussed by staff and in meetings of the Soil Survey Users Group—a group composed of County staff from DPWES (LDS, SWPD, UFD, MSMD), DPZ, Tax Administration, Health, and DIT (GIS), and VCE, NVSWCD and NRCS staff. It serves as a communication link among its members and is led by the NRCS Soil Survey Project Team Leader.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

Staff recommends that the expertise of the soil scientist is needed in the County, and that the soil scientist position should be extended beyond the completion of the soil survey update, due to be completed in January 2007. A trained soil scientist will be needed to act as a custodian and librarian of the updated soil survey. A soil scientist also will be needed to evaluate and interpret soils information, conduct soils investigations, provide advice, and lead soils-related training and education programs.

A soil survey is a dynamic document and requires on-going maintenance. With each change in land use, which often results in the disturbance of soils, the soils map must be updated to stay current. For instance, the soil survey update will be based on 2003 aerial photos; the Fairfax Corner shopping complex next to the Government Center had not been built at the time the 2003 aerial photos were taken. The area on the soil survey will be shown as a forested tract of undisturbed soil, when it is, in fact, parking lots and rooftops. As development such as this continues throughout the County, the soil survey will need to be constantly updated to reflect the changing conditions on the ground. As site-specific soil investigations are conducted, the soils map, which will be part of the County's GIS, will need to reflect the new information, and the attribute information, contained in a database, may need to be updated. Without these updates, the Fairfax County Soil Survey soils maps and associated information will be incorrect, possibly leading to inaccurate decision-making. The GIS Department has stated that a custodian needs to be designated as responsible for the maintenance of the Fairfax County Soil Survey. A trained soil scientist would act as the Survey's custodian and ensure that it accurately reflects the conditions on the ground.

In addition to maintaining the accuracy of the soil survey information, a soil scientist is needed to ensure that the information in the Soil Survey is properly and effectively used. The Soil Survey is for general planning purposes, and when updated, will consist of 1:12,000 scale maps (1 in. = 1,000 ft.) of the entire county and approximately 900 double-sided pages of explanatory written materials and data. This is a massive amount of information, with complex and inter-related details. The proper use of the maps and data found in the soil survey will be difficult for the layman without a proper guide. The soil scientist will know and understand the broad body of knowledge about soils, the information contained in the survey, and what information is needed for what purpose. The soil scientist will be able to direct customers to the information they need, tell them how to use it, and perhaps more importantly, explain to customers the improper uses of the survey. For example, the survey is accurate when viewed at the 1:12,000 scale; but, using the GIS capability to zoom into the map and obtain soils information at a larger scale (1 in. = 400 ft.) can lead to incorrect assumptions and would be an improper use of the Survey. The soil lines, when stretched to the larger scale, can become inaccurate because they would not contain soil inclusions that might have been mapped had the original mapping scale been larger. This could lead to flawed information going to the customer. A site-specific soils investigation conducted at the larger scale would be needed to yield accurate information for the larger scale. A trained soil scientist would be able to describe to customers the limits of the Survey as well as to be able to quickly gather the information that is relevant to the customer's

Ecological Resources #4

Continued

needs from the extensive amount of written data. A soil scientist uses professional judgment to evaluate a problem, reach conclusions, and make recommendations. For example, some of the characteristics of soils are expressed in 'ranges' requiring a soil scientist to make a judgment as to how to apply a range to a specific site. Without guidance, the soil survey easily can be misused or be too complicated for customers to navigate. When properly used, the information in the Soil Survey is defensible in court.

Engineers, consultants, land-use planners, and County staff will use the soil survey to determine soil and land characteristics that affect development, such as: percent slope; slope stability and slide potential; soil depth to bedrock; soil depth to seasonal water table; presence of hydric soils; probability of wetlands; surface drainage characteristics; suitability for compaction; bearing capacity and foundation support; erosion factor; shrink-swell potential; suitability for roads; permeability and suitability for infiltration trenches, other infiltration techniques of stormwater management, and ponds; and suitability for septic drain fields. Homeowners are interested in both productivity and engineering properties of soils. Soils information is used by tax assessors, realtors, wetland specialists, lake and pond owners, foresters, nursery operators, owners of small horse farms, park planners and managers, and DPWES stormwater planning and maintenance staff. Low-impact-development practices are gaining recognition as important tools for better controlling stormwater runoff. Most LID practices require in-situ soil information on a site's infiltration capacity and other soil hydrodynamic properties. The soil scientist can be very useful in preparing and interpreting this information.

In addition to the roles of soil survey librarian and custodian, the soil scientist would be an expert in the emerging field of human disturbed soils. Little is known of the behavior of human disturbed soils; however, a large percentage of Fairfax County soils have been or will be disturbed at some time. Studying these soils is a component of the current Soil Survey update. Human disturbed soils are generally denser and less permeable than undisturbed soils and create more runoff than undisturbed soils. Knowing the behavior and characteristics of human disturbed soils is vital for understanding the stormwater management and erosion issues that will affect Fairfax County in the future, especially as efforts towards meeting the Chesapeake Bay Agreement intensify.

The soil survey is designed for general planning purposes. Site-specific soil surveys and analyses often are needed, particularly when problem soils are present. The County soil scientist may conduct such surveys according to need and time available. It might be necessary to specify criteria for when this is done, such as for problems identified by County agencies, or at the request of the Director of DPWES. In Fauquier County, the county provides advice to the private sector, but charges for conducting site-specific surveys.

Expertise is needed to evaluate site-specific surveys conducted by private-sector soil scientists on behalf of their clients. At present the site-specific surveys submitted to the County as part of the site plan review process cannot, and should not, be incorporated as updates to the official Fairfax County Soil Survey. One such private survey mapped Marine clays in Chantilly, something that clearly is wrong. These surveys have not been subjected to a quality control protocol that assures they are of the same standard as the County's Soil Survey, which will have been updated

Ecological Resources #4

Continued

in accordance with a stringent quality assurance protocol and certified to federal national standards.

There is an essential need to inform and educate County staff and private sector consultants, engineers, landscape architects, soil scientists, realtors, and any interested groups and individuals about the type of information available about soils, when it is needed, how to access it, how to interpret it, and how it should be used. This should be done through training workshops and by creating printed, and web-based, information and guidance documents.

Of note, other jurisdictions in the Washington D.C. suburban area have soil scientists. Montgomery County, Prince Georges County, Washington D.C., Prince William County, Loudoun County and Fauquier County all have one or more soil scientists.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

Consideration should be given to continue to fund the expertise of a Soil Scientist, either as a new position on County staff, or by continuing to fund this position through the NVSWCD.

Keeping the soil scientist position within NVSWCD is cost efficient as it would not be necessary to create a new position and office space, and the NVSWCD staff already works with the soil scientist, in addition to answering requests for soils information.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2006? If so, please explain.

There are no additional budget implications for FY 2006.

The team that is conducting the Soil Survey Update consists of three members—two NRCS soil scientists and one NVSWCD soil scientist. NRCS is partially reimbursed by the County for the services of the Team Leader and a Soil Scientist. The third Soil Scientist on the team is fully funded by the County by providing funds to NVSWCD to support this position. Hence, while the County funds this position, and may specify its duties and responsibilities, it is not counted as a County staff position. Currently the position is carrying out duties associated with mapping and updating the County Soil Survey, and when asked, provides other services, such as advice on soils and conducting site-specific infiltration studies for bio-retention facilities.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

There would be longer-range fiscal implications beginning in FY 2008. The Soil Survey Update will be completed between the mid to end of FY 2007 and funding for the project will cease. The two NRCS members of the team are funded through December 2006 and the NVSWCD soil

Ecological Resources #4

Continued

scientist is funded through June 2007. If the expertise of a soil scientist were to be continued, a funding allocation would be needed in the FY 2008 budget.

There would be budget implications for FY 2007, should the position be upgraded mid-year, after the completion of the major work of the update project, and in consideration of the additional responsibilities of a County soil scientist.

Response to 2004 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Wildlife – Deer Management #1

VII-1. WILDLIFE—DEER MANAGEMENT

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC recommends that the Board of Supervisors continue to implement and monitor the comprehensive deer management program set forth in the Integrated Deer Management Plan adopted in November, 1998 and refined by the County Executive's Deer Management Committee in the summer of 1999 and in subsequent periodic meetings. EQAC strongly supports the following broad goals encompassed in the plan and in the subsequent studies and evaluations:

- Management based on reduction of local deer populations to sustainable levels.
- Management based on a sound ecological approach that emphasizes biodiversity without preferential treatment of particular species.
- Management based on an "in perpetuity" perspective that does not trade long-term interests for short-term gains.
- Protection, restoration, and enhancement of the natural areas and environments that have been subjected to degradation by deer overabundance.

LEAD AGENCY: Police—Animal Services

COORDINATING AGENCY/IES: FCPA; Police—Public Information Office

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Earl L. Hodnett, Wildlife Biologist

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

In the summer of 2004, a total of twenty-five parks (seventeen FCPA and eight NVRPA) were selected as potential sites for deer herd reduction. As in past years, each park authority Board of Directors selected the methods which could be used at each site. This year both park authorities approved archery, sharpshooting and managed shotgun hunts as acceptable methods.

While managed shotgun hunts are an approved method by both park authorities, parks large enough to safely conduct such hunts are quite limited. As the herds in these larger parks are reduced to desired levels, those parks are removed from the active management category.

Wildlife – Deer Management #1

Continued

The table below lists the parks approved for management activities and the approved methods.
Key: Sharpshooting (SS), Archery (A), Managed Hunt (MH)

Park	Size in Sq. Miles ¹ (640 acres/Mi ²)	Approved Methods
Bull Run Park (NVRPA)	1.36	Archery, Managed Hunts, Sharpshooting
Clark's Crossing (FCPA)	.225	Sharpshooting
Colvin Run S.V. (FCPA)	0.11	Archery, Sharpshooting
Cub Run S.V. (FCPA)	1.29	Archery, Sharpshooting
Difficult Run S.V. (FCPA)	1.35	Archery, Sharpshooting
Eakin Park (FCPA)	.089	Sharpshooting
Ellanor C. Lawrence Park (FCPA)	1.01	Sharpshooting
Fountainhead Park (NVRPA) Occoquan Watershed Properties	1.33	Archery, Sharpshooting
Fox Mill (FCPA)	0.33	Archery, Sharpshooting
Hemlock Overlook (NVRPA)	0.66	Sharpshooting
Huntley Meadows Park (FCPA)	2.23	Archery, Sharpshooting, Managed Hunts
Lake Accotink (FCPA)	0.63	Sharpshooting
Lake Fairfax Park (FCPA)	0.72	Sharpshooting

Wildlife – Deer Management #1
Continued

Laurel Hill (FCPA)	1.30	Sharpshooting
Meadowlark Gardens (NVRPA)	0.15	Archery, Sharpshooting
Occoquan Park (NVRPA)	0.63	Sharpshooting
Pohick Bay (NVRPA)	1.56	Archery, Managed Hunts, Sharpshooting
Riverbend Park (FCPA)	0.63	Sharpshooting
Sandy Run (NVRPA)	0.48	Archery, Sharpshooting
Scotts Run (FCPA)	0.60	Sharpshooting
South Run S.V. (FCPA)	0.56	Sharpshooting
Sully Plantation (FCPA)	0.28	Sharpshooting
Sully Woods (FCPA)	2.22	Managed Hunts, Sharpshooting
Upper Potomac (NVRPA)	0.57	Managed Hunts, Sharpshooting
Wakefield Park (FCPA)	0.46	Sharpshooting

1 All park sizes represent dry land or suitable deer habitat (lake acreage is subtracted from total park size) and were obtained from the corresponding Park Authority

Priorities are determined by a number of factors including park size, herd size (or a combination of both), degree of habitat damage, status of herd survey data, estimated staff hours required to reach goals, park operation requirements, and seasonal closure of parks or park facilities.

Indicators support the belief that Bull Run Regional Park, Upper Potomac Regional Park, and Meadowlark Gardens attained the desired herd density goal of 15 - 20 deer per square mile in 2003. Huntley Meadows Park and Ellanor C. Lawrence Park reached this goal shortly thereafter. In the case of Meadowlark Gardens, the density is actually 0 since the park has been encompassed by a deer-proof fence. Bull Run Regional Park and Upper Potomac Regional Park had harbored some of Fairfax County's largest deer herds. These two parks will continue to be monitored in future years and periodic small-scale control measures may be employed as

Wildlife – Deer Management #1

Continued

necessary. Once a herd has been reduced to the desired herd density, management measures to maintain that level can be infrequent and on a much smaller scale.

The Fairfax County Park Authority and the Northern Virginia Regional Park Authority continue to work with the County Wildlife Biologist to achieve the objectives stated in the Countywide Deer Management Program. Diligent efforts of the Park Authorities and Police Department staff have reduced herd sizes in several parks to the point where previously bare forest floor is again covered with flowering herbs, shrubs and tree seedlings. The Fairfax County Park Authority is working to implement its Natural Resource Management Plan and continues to work with organizations and groups that are assisting the agency in re-establishing the understory in our forests.

Again this year, infrared activated cameras were used to assess deer population densities within most of the parks under consideration. These cameras have proven to be a valuable tool for gathering baseline data as well as a means of monitoring the effectiveness of control efforts.

An effort has been made to move the program from a reactive one dealing with "hotspots" to a more comprehensive approach. It is believed that control efforts initiated at an earlier stage could prevent natural areas from being subjected to the level of damage seen in some of the larger parks. This approach is more environmentally sound and would require a smaller investment of time and money.

Sharpshooting is being utilized in both NVRPA and FCPA parks. Sharpshooting will continue through the end of March each year under a state permit. Both sharpshooting and managed hunt techniques continue to be refined and improved making the Fairfax County program one of the best in the nation.

As was first noted during the growing season of 2002, a continued marked improvement has been observed in the understory of the parks which have reached deer herd density goals. Plants that have not been seen growing on the forest floor since the late 1980's are once again growing. Ornamental shrubs now have to be trimmed instead of replaced. While it will take years for the habitat to rebound, these early precursors are quite encouraging. Following an adequate recovery period, assessments can be made of plant species that were extirpated by the years of overbrowsing. This data could then be used to design a restoration program to return the park environments to their earlier state.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

Measurement of deer herd densities should continue, as should appropriate control and management efforts. The addition of an Assistant Wildlife Biologist position would greatly enhance the outreach/education capabilities of the Deer Management Program.

Efforts should also be undertaken to identify appropriate local and state resources which could formulate and implement a habitat restoration program for public lands within Fairfax County.

Wildlife – Deer Management #1

Continued

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2006? If so, please explain.

Current Deer Management funding level should be maintained and additional staff needs to be committed to the program. The requirements of this program and other wildlife issues within the County have now exceeded the dedicated resources (one staff position). Budgeted funds for the FY 2006 may be reduced. It is unknown at this time how much of the management effort will be have to be scaled back.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range implications? If so, please explain.

An additional position would require a long-term funding commitment. Both the Deer Management Program and any planned restoration program require a long-term commitment of funding and resources. It has already been shown that management efforts at earlier stages require the harvest of fewer deer at a corresponding lower rate per deer.

Response to 2004 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Wildlife—Deer Management #2

(Page 205 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC strongly commends active participation of the Fairfax County Park Authority in the deer management program in order to provide enhanced stewardship of the parks, golf courses, and other parklands under its care and management. EQAC strongly endorses the joint efforts of the Park Authority and the Animal Services Division of the FCPD to take the program to parks that have not yet been served. Further, EQAC recommends that techniques be employed to concentrate deer in the safest parts of smaller parks when using sharpshooters in order to maximize safety for surrounding neighborhoods.

Lead agencies for this response: FCPA

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: Police—Animal Services

Contact person: Charles Smith, Naturalist III, Natural Resource Management and Protection (703-324-8555; charles.smith@fairfaxcounty.gov)

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

The Park Authority continues to be a full partner in the County deer management program and coordinate closely with the County Wildlife Biologist. Approximately eight park locations were added to the list of potential control sites for the 2004-5 permit season. Generally smaller parks are monitored but are currently not being planned for active management due to problems of controlling human access during management activities and/or the proximity of homes or businesses.

Animal Services Division Input: The Fairfax County Park Authority continues to work as a full partner in the implementation of the Deer Management Program. Their assistance with planning and logistical challenges has an integral part of the program. Only through this type of cooperative approach can the program continue its high level of success.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

The Park Authority is addressing this recommendation.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

The Park Authority will continue to fully support the deer management program, sponsor and support research and deer population control efforts, and seek ways to expand the program to additional sites.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2006? If so, please explain.

No new positions have been added or proposed for FY 2006. Current activities are being supported within existing budgets.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

Effective deer management will require additional staff and equipment over time. The impact of excessive deer browse cannot be valued fully in natural areas but has a significant influence on the health and composition of plant communities and dependent animal populations. Deer continue to cause significant impacts to park landscaped vegetation, lawns and gardens, impacts to infrastructure such as golf course greens and tees during wet periods and occasional vehicle collisions.

Response to 2004 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Wildlife – Deer Management #3

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC believes that, while some progress has been made, particularly through the use of archery, the Deer Management Program must address increased attention to the problems of small private (mostly residential) property owners who are suffering serious impacts from deer and develop means for them legally to exercise effective control measures. EQAC recognizes that this problem is complicated by the overlay of existing State regulations and recommends that our county program officers work closely with State officials to ease these where possible.

LEAD AGENCY: Police—Animal Services

COORDINATING AGENCY/IES: FCPA

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Earl L. Hodnett, Wildlife Biologist

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

The Virginia Department of Game & Inland Fisheries (DGIF) will issue permits to property owners experiencing damage from deer or any other wildlife. Many citizens are unaware of this program. Fairfax County and DGIF have increased efforts to inform citizens of this option. Additionally, state code now allows an extended urban archery deer hunting season. Fairfax County has participated in this program since 2002. DGIF then offered selected local jurisdictions across the state a post-season extension to the urban archery option. This regulation expands the deer hunting season in Fairfax County by twelve weeks. These changes in state regulations now offer citizens a wide array of opportunities to manage local deer herds. Since archers harvest the majority of deer taken on private property in the County, this urban season expands the opportunities for property owners and their guests. Public education efforts will be expanded to include information on these changes.

Deer management on small private properties has been and will continue to be more challenging than management programs conducted on public lands. At numerous levels, staff provides advisory assistance to property owners. The County Program has used some innovative approaches to this problem. The Animal Services Division issues permits for firearms use to eligible property owners. The Fairfax County Wildlife Biologist advises property owners of available management options or exclusion techniques.

It has become routine procedure to inform citizens of all existing options allowed under the law. This information is provided in all public speaking engagements as well as telephone and e-mail contacts. The County Deer Management web page provides information about ways private property owners can cope with deer problems.

Wildlife – Deer Management #3

Continued

While a number of citizens have offered the use of their property for sharpshooting activities, this expansion of the program has not yet been recommended by staff nor approved by the BOS. Such an expansion would further dilute the existing manpower and material resources of the program. Without additional resource allocation, a recommendation to expand sharpshooting onto private properties would be premature until all available public lands have been adequately treated.

Animal Services and FCPA continue to perform outreach with private landowners who control property adjacent to or adjoining public lands to develop and coordinate deer management programs. Furthermore, FCPA has a letter explaining the legal issues related to game retrieval from another landowner's property, and how retrieval of wounded animals from Park Authority property may be facilitated.

The Fairfax County Park Authority, as a partner in the Fairfax County Deer Management Program, fully supports the efforts by adjacent property owners and other county landowners and interested citizens and organizations to undertake deer herd management activities. Park Authority staff respond to numerous citizen contacts per year requesting information on deer hunting activities on park land and throughout the county. Staff participated in citizen workshops that, while addressing other environmental issues, included discussion periods where citizens sought information on wildlife conflict resolution and deer control on their land.

Animal Services has worked closely with DGIF to identify the unique needs of private landowners in urban areas. Efforts to adapt regulations and state code sections to further address problems faced by these landowners are ongoing. DGIF is presently organizing committees across the state to review and update the State Deer Management Plan. The Fairfax County Wildlife Biologist will be a member of the committee for this region. The issue of deer control on private suburban properties will be one of the agenda items.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

Additional efforts, as possible, will be made to expand the public education and outreach components of the Deer Management Program. This is particularly important for the provision of new information and legal updates to citizens.

Expansion of the present Deer Management Program to include private property would benefit from an additional Wildlife Biologist position in the Animal Services Division. Without additional staffing, the Deer Management Program must presently be limited to public lands. Once deer herds on these areas are brought under control, resources can be shifted toward private parcels if staff is so directed.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2006? If so, please explain.

Current Deer Management funding level should be maintained.

Wildlife – Deer Management #3

Continued

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range implications? If so, please explain.

An additional position would require a long-term funding commitment.

Response to 2004 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Wildlife – Deer Management #4

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC believes that the management program must continue to accomplish the following key objectives:

- a) Immediate and sustained measures for reduction of the deer population in order to return the size of the local herds to levels consistent with the long term carrying capacity of their particular local habitats.
- b) Ongoing monitoring and evaluation of new methods for maintaining population limits over the long term, such as immunocontraception and other experimental methods.
- c) Consideration of development in the county and its effects on ecosystem health and biodiversity as these relate to deer management as well as to the quality of life generally.

LEAD AGENCY: Police—Animal Services

COORDINATING AGENCY/IES: FCPA; Police—Public Information Office

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Earl L. Hodnett, Wildlife Biologist

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

The management program continues to reduce local herds to levels consistent with the long-term carrying capacity of remaining habitats. Managed hunts, sharpshooting and private/public partnerships are combined to apply the necessary control pressure to first stabilize and then reduce deer herds. Cooperative efforts have proven to be very successful in the reduction of herds on a home range scale. Progress has been made in formulating cooperative agreements between federal, state and regional landholders for home range scale management of deer.

Fairfax County continues to monitor developments and progress of non-lethal methods of deer herd control such as immunocontraception. Recent research has demonstrated a new method which requires only a single dose and renders fallow deer sterile for at least three years. While this product must undergo further study and regulation approvals, it may be a viable technique for consideration for use in Fairfax County. Fairfax County remains ready to cooperate with any university or other research organization seeking to develop such techniques as would be applicable in the control of a free ranging herd.

It is commonly recognized that development of natural areas exacerbates the problems associated with a growing deer herd. This typically is the result of the rapid development of Fairfax

Wildlife – Deer Management #4

Continued

County. Development outside the County boundaries (and control) also has an effect on biodiversity and deer populations within Fairfax County. Heavy development in Loudoun County appears to have pushed additional deer into northern Fairfax County.

Current data collection targets deer/automobile crashes and is considered in control and management planning. The Wildlife Biologist is working in cooperation with other agencies to identify additional means of data collection to address ecosystem health and biodiversity issues. The collection of this additional data must be a multi-agency partnership to effectively evaluate impacts on the quality of life. The Wildlife Biologist will actively work with our established partners toward this goal.

The Park Authority concurs with these recommendations. FCPA will continue to participate in and support herd reduction, monitoring and assessment. FCPA shares the goal of reducing herd levels to those that are compatible with healthy ecosystems. Realistically, this means that the deer herd reduction program will not only continue indefinitely, but must expand to include private citizens controlling deer on their property in addition to control programs on public lands. The assessment of the effects of development on ecosystem health and biodiversity is a very important issue and one that must be looked at long-term utilizing efforts by others as well as efforts internal to Fairfax County. This would seem to be an ideal project in which to engage colleges and universities.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

The measurement of deer herd densities should continue, as should ongoing control and management efforts. The addition of an Assistant Wildlife Biologist position would greatly enhance the outreach/education capabilities of the Deer Management Program.

The Wildlife Biologist participates in a Council of Government sub-committee formed to look at the issue of highways and wildlife. One of the expected products of this effort will be a regional handbook of design and retrofit techniques for roads and highway development. A regional public service announcement video is also expected to be provided to COG member jurisdictions.

Further actions should be taken to identify and coordinate with Fairfax County, state, and private sector entities involved in the planning and development process. Better collection and utilization of existing or new data in this process should be a shared goal.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2006? If so, please explain.

Current Deer Management funding level should be maintained.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range implications? If so, please explain.

An additional position would require recurring funding. Furthermore, in the long-term, additional requirements or review steps could have budgetary or other implications, for not only Animal Services, but other agencies.

Response to 2004 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Wildlife – Deer Management #5

EQAC Recommendation:

Since public acceptance of, and participation in, deer management programs is more easily achieved when there is full public understanding of the problem, the available management options, and their costs and other consequences, EQAC strongly recommends that the Board of Supervisors continue to provide for a vigorous program of public education as is now being done by the Animal Services Division and on the county's Web site.

LEAD AGENCY: Police—Animal Services

COORDINATING AGENCY/IES: OPA; Police—Public Information Office

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Earl L. Hodnett, Wildlife Biologist

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

Educational efforts have been underway since the inception of the Fairfax County Integrated Deer Management Plan. While a wide variety of mediums for information dispersal have been used, additional means are being explored. This will include a better utilization of the County's cable TV capabilities. The Fairfax County Wildlife Biologist has worked with Channel 16 to produce three one half hour wildlife programs. The programs entitled *Fairfax County's Wild Side* highlight wildlife issues. One program was entirely dedicated to the white-tailed deer. Also under consideration are one minute spots which would cover a variety of wildlife topics and run between other program slots.

Publications available in the Fairfax County Library system will be updated and expanded annually. These resources coupled with the County Deer Management page on the County's Web site will provide citizens with readily available reference materials. The Park Authority can support such an outreach and education effort by displaying brochures at our Parks and RECenters, placing information and links on our website, incorporating messages into our programming as appropriate, and responding to citizen questions about deer programs.

Celebrate Fairfax provides an opportunity to reach a large number of County citizens. An interactive display on wildlife concerns was again part of the Public Safety display. These large events are perfect venues for wildlife displays. New portable displays have been developed for use at large events such as Celebrate Fairfax as well as at libraries and schools. The Deer Management in Fairfax County brochure has been printed and distributed to points of contact throughout the County. This brochure is due to be updated as soon as resources permit.

For the fourth year in a row, the Animal Services Division was invited to provide a display about white-tailed deer and other urban wildlife at the National Zoo during their celebration of native

Wildlife – Deer Management #5

Continued

wildlife. This two-day event attracts very large crowds (16,000+ on Saturday alone) and many of the visitors are Fairfax County residents. As in past years, comments received from visitors were overwhelmingly supportive of the County's Deer Management activities.

When the County conducts managed deer hunts, staff is always available to answer questions from either citizens or the media. While education is a dynamic and continual component of the Fairfax County Integrated Deer Management Plan, some examples of educational efforts during the last year included:

- a) Channel 16's *County Magazine* annually runs a segment about deer and the County's Deer Management Program.
- b) The Police Department Public Information Office again produced a news release on safe driving tips to heighten public awareness of the increased hazard that deer pose during the fall rut.
 - The Wildlife Biologist again presented programs and had a display on white-tailed deer at the Providence District Environmental Workshop. This has developed into an annual event benefiting citizens of Providence District.
 - The Wildlife Biologist has utilized the well-established Citizens Advisory Committee program as a means of meeting with local communities to answer citizen wildlife concerns and to disseminate information about the County's wildlife programs.
 - Staff education is an important facet of the program. Various meetings have been held to ensure that staff is aware of the details of the Deer Management Program and are better able to respond to citizen inquiries. Staff briefings, fact sheets and broadcast e-mail have been utilized to keep staff abreast of wildlife issues and developments. Such information has been presented to the Board of Supervisors staffs, the Police Department Public Information Office, the Office of Public Affairs and the Fairfax County Park Authority park managers.
 - Fairfax County has effectively used the Internet by posting updates of information on deer. Deer control efforts and deer-related human safety issues are also covered and updated as new information becomes available.
 - Business style cards advertising the deer management page on the County's Web site have been printed for distribution at events and meetings.

The challenge of educating a large, diverse and mobile population is indeed daunting. Staff continues to seek the development of new methods to address this need.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

The addition of an Assistant Wildlife Biologist position would greatly enhance the outreach/education capabilities of the Deer Management Program. The position would also be beneficial for other issues including the increasing problem of West Nile virus. FCPA recognizes the need and supports the addition of an Assistant Wildlife Biologist position.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2006? If so, please explain.

Current Deer Management funding level should be maintained.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range implications? If so, please explain.

An additional position would require a long-term funding commitment.

Response to 2004 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Wildlife – Deer Management #6

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC endorses ongoing public input into the plan, including surveys of public opinion and the inclusion of major stakeholders (home owners, environmental preservationists, public safety experts, wildlife biologists, public health experts, sport hunting groups, animal rights groups, etc.) in the continued refinement and implementation of the plan. EQAC fully supports continuation of both the input of a broad range of views and the use of spokespersons, such as the County Wildlife Biologist, who can articulate program goals and the ongoing management approach to the varied community groups and viewpoints.

LEAD AGENCY: Police—Animal Services

COORDINATING AGENCY/IES: FCPA; Police—Public Information Office

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Earl L. Hodnett, Wildlife Biologist

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

The County web page devoted to deer management issues (<http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/comm/deer/deermgt.htm>) continues to be updated and expanded. This site provides a wealth of information to citizens about the issue and the efforts being undertaken to deal with the associated problems. Citizens are able to send e-mail through this site to voice their opinions or to ask questions.

Input is also received from citizens via telephone, e-mail or conversations at meetings of special interest groups, civic associations, professional conferences, garden clubs or other public gatherings. Presentations about deer issues and the County's plan of response are routinely provided to citizens at various meetings. Such meetings as community association meetings, Police Department Citizen Advisory Committee meetings, Police Department Citizen's Police Academy sessions and the Animal Services Advisory Commission are opportunities for information exchange and citizen input. All of these sources are utilized in the assessment and improvement of the Program.

FCPA has participated in developing the Fairfax County web pages related to the deer management plan, has featured deer information in Nature Center programs and frequently fields questions from citizens regarding the plan.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

Staff recognizes the importance and value of public input, including a broad range of views, and has and will continue to seek new venues and methods to both seek input and provide related information to citizens.

Wildlife – Deer Management #6

Continued

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2006? If so, please explain.

Current Deer Management funding level should be maintained.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range implications? If so, please explain.

The Deer Management Committee and/or other means for collection of community input and discussion should continue, and must be supported.

Response to 2004 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: WILDLIFE—GEESE MANAGEMENT #1

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC finds the current programs are effective and should be continued and, where feasible, expanded.

LEAD AGENCY: Police—Animal Services

COORDINATING AGENCY/IES: Police—Public Information Office

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Earl L. Hodnett, Wildlife Biologist

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

The Animal Services Division concurs with EQAC's recommendation and intends to continue and expand the current programs. As the number of volunteers/cooperators increases, the effectiveness of the addling program should proportionately increase. Enhanced partnerships with GeesePeace and FCPA have been beneficial in the past. However, GeesePeace personnel notified the Animal Services Division that they would be unable to continue the program partnership with Fairfax County. They have chosen to utilize their resources to promote such programs across the nation. While the Animal Services Division desires to continue a goose management program, it is unclear at this time what the new program will encompass.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

A new program will be developed and staff will seek ways and means to expand efforts.

However, although public/private partnerships should continue and be expanded, there will be a need for a staff member who could devote time to this program throughout the year. A data base of cooperating land owners as well as trained volunteers needs to be developed and maintained if the program is to produce the desired results. An Assistant Wildlife Biologist position would benefit and enhance this program as well. A successful program requires community education and outreach, volunteer coordination, data collection and analysis, outreach and coordination with other local, state, and federal agencies.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2006? If so, please explain.

Current Geese Management funding level should be maintained.

Wildlife – Geese Management #1
Continued

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range implications? If so, please explain.

An additional position would require a long-term funding commitment.

Response to 2004 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: WILDLIFE—GEESE MANAGEMENT #2

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC feels that the current programs need to be replicated in many other areas of the county by training additional citizens and homeowner groups in goose population stabilization methodology.

LEAD AGENCY: Police—Animal Services

COORDINATING AGENCY/IES: Police—Public Information Office

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Earl L. Hodnett, Wildlife Biologist

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

In the past, the Fairfax County Wildlife Biologist in association with GeesePeace conducted a series of volunteer training sessions prior to the spring nesting season each year. A new program will require a fresh look at the mechanics of this process. Year-round efforts must be undertaken to identify and recruit property owners who will permit addling of Canada goose nests located on their property.

At the January 27, 2003 Board of Supervisors meeting, OPA was directed to assist in providing public notice of volunteer training sessions for this program.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

Subject to the design of a new program, efforts will be directed to expand the number of trained volunteers and of cooperating property owners. A successful program requires community education and outreach, volunteer coordination, data collection and analysis, outreach and coordination with other agencies, including local, state, and federal.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2006? If so, please explain.

Current Geese Management funding level should be maintained.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range implications? If so, please explain.

An additional position would require a long-term funding commitment.

Response to 2004 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: WILDLIFE—GEESE MANAGEMENT #3

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC recommends enhanced public education outreach to sensitize all Fairfax County residents and owners of nonresidential properties to the pollution problems caused by geese and the programs available for addressing them.

LEAD AGENCY: Police—Animal Services

COORDINATING AGENCY/IES: OPA; Police—Public Information Office

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Earl L. Hodnett, Wildlife Biologist

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

The Animal Services Division will be working in cooperation with state and federal officials to gather data on the effects of resident goose populations upon local tidal marshlands in Fairfax County. This information will be provided to the public through existing methods. The Division has worked with Channel 16 to produce programming which covers Canada geese and the issues related to them.

Display units have been purchased for use in developing traveling displays addressing various wildlife issues. These displays can be used as "backdrops" for presentations to citizen groups or as stand-alone displays at libraries and schools.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

The Animal Services Division concurs with EQAC's recognition of the need for expanded public education on this topic. This is a common component of all the wildlife programs and issues the County faces now and will face in future years. The addition of an Assistant Wildlife Biologist would greatly enhance the outreach capabilities of the Geese Management Program.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2006? If so, please explain.

Current Geese Management funding level should be maintained.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range implications? If so, please explain.

An additional position would require a long-term funding commitment.

Response to 2004 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: WILDLIFE—GEESE MANAGEMENT #4

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC recommends enhanced public education outreach to acquaint all Fairfax County residents with the role excessive goose populations play in destruction of our marshland habitats.

LEAD AGENCY: Police—Animal Services

COORDINATING AGENCY/IES: OPA; Police—Public Information Office

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Earl L. Hodnett, Wildlife Biologist

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

The Animal Services Division is presently developing a goose management program to replace the program formally known as GeesePeace. The Fairfax County Wildlife Biologist provides information about all available options and programs to property owners through telephone and e-mail contacts. A new website will be developed to better convey current information and available management options.

Previously, the Office of Public Affairs has assisted with the outreach to County residents, by sending a news release to the media announcing the geese stabilization program. This news release sought two distinct audiences. It solicited volunteers to be trained to addle eggs and encouraged residents to notify GeesePeace via a property owner's consent form if they owned a property with a goose population where addling could be performed. This information was also included in the Public Affairs publication *News to Use* which is sent to nearly 1700 County homeowners and citizens associations that in turn may use the information in their newsletters. This outreach effort will be reformatted to describe the new program.

Recent programming development with Channel 16 should provide an excellent educational opportunity. In addition to a program dedicated to Canada geese in Fairfax County, there may be the possibility of developing short (30 second - 1 minute) public safety announcements which would air between other programming. These short segments could be utilized to address this or any other wildlife issue.

The Facilities Management Division did an excellent job on the production of a County Web site covering the Herrity Building Habitat Modification Project.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

An additional staff position, an Assistant Wildlife Biologist, would be beneficial and afford the resources necessary to expand the educational outreach efforts of the Animal Services Division. Expansion of the Division's information on the County's Web site to cover more wildlife topics

Wildlife – Geese Management #4

Continued

would be a top priority. It would also double the ability to accommodate requests for presentations and programming.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2006? If so, please explain.

Current Geese Management funding level should be maintained.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range implications? If so, please explain.

An additional position would require a long-term funding commitment.

Response to 2004 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Wildlife – Wildlife Borne Diseases #1

(Page VII-101 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC recommends that the Board of Supervisors provide continued active support to the reorganized Stream Monitoring Program in which the Stream Protection Strategies Program of the DPWES will perform sample collection and field testing and the Health Department will perform laboratory testing and analysis functions. EQAC recommends that county staff ensure the posting of advisories on the county Web sites when polluted waters are identified. EQAC further recommends that the Board of Supervisors monitor the program through periodic reports to its Environmental Committee.

Lead agencies for this response: DPWES (SWPD)

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: Health; OPA

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Laura Grape

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

DPWES assumed the Health Department's role of collecting water quality samples in calendar year 2003. The Health Department laboratory will continue to process collected samples for fecal coliform and *E. coli* bacteria, in addition to phosphorous, nitrate, and nitrite levels.

This recommendation, as it related to posting advisories to the county's Web sites, is in the process of being addressed. Web pages are currently being developed for posting advisories, reporting annual results, and providing educational information.

The county's comprehensive biological stream monitoring report will also be available for download from the county's Web site. Other actions for posting advisories and information are explained further under the response for EQAC's Water Resources #6 recommendation.

News releases for local and regional newspapers on information related to the annual report and stream advisories will be prepared by county staff. The news releases will be posted on the county's Web site, included in News to Use (an email newsletter sent to citizens) and included in Newslink (a daily e-mail newsletter sent to all county employees).

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

Please see above. DPWES will integrate results from all biological stream monitoring programs into an annual report, which will be provided to the Board of Supervisors, as well as posted on the county's Web site.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

Please see the response for EQAC's Water Resources #6 recommendation.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2006? If so, please explain.

No. There is no special funding for the county's comprehensive stream monitoring program, which includes bacteria monitoring. Costs are supported through the Stormwater Planning Division's general operations fund.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

Yes. In order to continue the programs cited above, a dedicated funding source for the county's stormwater management program should be considered.

Response to 2004 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Wildlife – Wildlife Borne Diseases #2

(Page 224 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC recommends that the Health Department continue and enhance its excellent public education programs.

LEAD AGENCY: Health

COORDINATING AGENCY/IES: OPA

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Glenn Smith

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

This recommendation is continuing to be implemented and enhanced as EQAC has recommended. The Health Department has translated some of its more essential West Nile Virus public education material into Spanish, Korean, Vietnamese, and Basic Chinese and has evaluated the impact of this program with a Knowledge, Attitudes, and Practices (KAP) study that was concluded prior to FY2005. The KAP study is allowing the Health Department to better direct the West Nile Virus public education and information program to insure greater impact in all sectors of the community. During the summer of FY2004-FY2005, the WNV program distributed over 250,000 pieces of educational information material to members of the community. At present the WNV program is creating new documents and translating others into Spanish and Korean.

Fairfax County is working collaboratively with other jurisdictions and with the Council of Governments and chairs the Mosquito Borne Pathogens Committee.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

The Health Department concurs and supports the EQAC recommendation as it is one of the main methods for disease prevention.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

No new actions need be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2006? If so, please explain.

Funding for the FY2006 WNV Program has been established.

Wildlife – Wildlife Borne Diseases #2

Continued

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

Continued budget funding for the WNV Program.

Response to 2004 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Wildlife—WILDLIFE BORNE DISEASES #3

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC recommends that the Police Department continue its animal control program and, in conjunction with the Health Department, expand public education initiatives in key areas, such as control of rabies and of wildlife contributing to pollution of surface waters.

LEAD AGENCY: Police—Animal Services

COORDINATING AGENCY/IES: Health; OPA; Police—Public Information Office

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Earl L. Hodnett, Wildlife Biologist

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

The Animal Services Division routinely provides the public with information on rabies and other wildlife borne diseases. Rabies is addressed on the Animal Services webpage at: www.fairfaxcounty.gov/ps/ac/rabfacts.htm. There is also a link to the Health Department's page which describes the former oral rabies vaccine program. In addition, the Animal Services Division conducts rabies vaccination clinics every other month. Rabies is also addressed in the Division's brochure entitled *Your Pets and the Law*.

The Health Department has an excellent brochure entitled *Rabies and Animal Bites; What You Should Know and What You Should Do*. The Animal Services Division and the Health Department work very closely on all potential rabies exposure cases.

Both the Health Department and the Animal Services Division participate in the Animal Control Regional Roundtable. This is a group compiled of representatives from the animal control departments and health departments of various jurisdictions throughout the region. This group has chosen to expand the topics of discussion beyond rabies to include all wildlife diseases.

The Fairfax County Wildlife Biologist established an e-mail group for rapid conveyance of wildlife disease information. This group includes the DGIF, the Wildlife Biologist, the Animal Control Regional Roundtable, the Animal Services Division Commander, FCPA, and the Health Department. As potential issues are identified, informational updates are provided to the OPA, the Police Department's PIO, the County Executive, and the Board of Supervisors. If warranted, information is then disseminated to the public through normal means.

The staff of the Animal Services Division routinely disseminates current wildlife disease information and includes such information in most public presentations and other points of contact. One program produced by Channel 16 in cooperation with the Animal Services

Wildlife – Wildlife Borne Diseases #3

Continued

Division was devoted to educating the public about Canada geese and the associated health and pollution concerns.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

The Animal Services Division, the Wildlife Biologist, and the Health Department will continue to work closely with other County staff, as well as state and federal agencies, to ensure early identification of potential wildlife disease issues. This information will then be provided to the public in the most expeditious way. An Assistant Wildlife Biologist position would benefit and enhance this program. A successful program requires community education and outreach, volunteer coordination, data collection and analysis, outreach and coordination with other agencies, including local, state, and federal.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2006? If so, please explain.

Current Geese Management funding level should be maintained.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range implications? If so, please explain.

An additional position would require a long-term funding commitment.

Response to 2004 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Wildlife – Wildlife Borne Diseases #4

(Page 224 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC recommends that the Board of Supervisors provide active support to the newly instituted program for epidemiology and abatement of insect vector-borne diseases such as West Nile Virus. EQAC further recommends that the Board of Supervisors monitor this program through periodic reports to its Environment Committee by county staff.

LEAD AGENCY: Health

COORDINATING AGENCY/IES: None

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Glenn Smith

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

This recommendation has been addressed.

The Board of Supervisors has provided and continues to provide support for the newly instituted program for epidemiology and abatement of insect vector-borne diseases such as WNV. The Health Department, through the Mosquito Surveillance and Management Subcommittee (MSMS), a subcommittee of the Environmental Coordinating Committee, provides periodic reports of the program and the Health Department periodically informs the Board of Supervisors in more direct manners. A Progress Report and Plan of Action are prepared and presented to the Board of Supervisors annually.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

Compliance with the EQAC recommendation requires no new action need be taken.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2006? If so, please explain.

Funding for the WNV program has been established for FY2006.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

Continued budget funding for the WNV Program.

Response to 2004 EQAC Recommendation

Noise #1

(Page 237 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

Continue to support airport noise compatible land use planning near airports in the county through the implementation of policies and regulations that reference the most current airport noise contour projections for the airports and that are at least as stringent as federal noise compatibility guidelines.

Lead agencies for this response: DPZ

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: None

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Noel Kaplan

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

This recommendation has been addressed and will need to be revisited whenever updated airport noise projection information becomes available.

Fairfax County's Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Ordinance have long supported airport noise compatible planning in the area near Washington Dulles International Airport. Both the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Ordinance reference the most recent airport noise contour projections for the airport that have been provided by the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority (MWAA); the contours were last updated in 1997, with the DNL 65 dBA contour (based on a worst-case overlay of several projections provided by MWAA) defining the boundary of the Airport Noise Impact Overlay District of the Zoning Ordinance, and with the long-term projected DNL 60 dBA contour defining the extent of the Dulles Airport Noise Impact Area that is referenced in the Comprehensive Plan. Comprehensive Plan policy recommends against new residential development inside the DNL 60 dBA noise contour; the effect has been to preclude residential rezonings inside this contour.

Neither existing nor projected airport noise impacts above DNL 60 dBA have been projected in Fairfax County for operations at Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport. Operations at Davison U.S. Army Airfield may potentially affect a small area off of Fort Belvoir to the north of the airfield in an area that is largely industrial in character. Comprehensive Plan policy regarding new residential development inside the projected DNL 60 dBA impact area will be a consideration if and when any new residential zoning requests are pursued in this area.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

We concur with the recommendation and feel that it is being addressed.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

Airport noise contour projections associated with Washington Dulles International Airport should be kept current in the Zoning Ordinance and Comprehensive Plan as updated projections are issued by MWAA.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2006? If so, please explain.

No.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

No.

Response to 2004 EQAC Recommendation

Noise #2

(Page 237 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

Develop and distribute materials to educate the public on airport noise issues, including airport noise contours, noise compatible planning and regulation, noise changes that may result from new construction and changes in flight frequencies, and noise complaint procedures. Incorporate these educational materials into the county's overall environmental educational efforts.

Lead agencies for this response: DPZ

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: OPA

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Noel Kaplan

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

This recommendation has not been addressed and is not in progress, although airport noise contour projections associated with Washington Dulles International Airport are provided in the Area III volume of the County's Comprehensive Plan, along with guidance relating these contour projections to County policy regarding land use compatibility. The last major County effort regarding airport noise-related outreach occurred in conjunction with the 1997 revisions to the County's adopted noise contours (both in the Zoning Ordinance and Comprehensive Plan) and related Comprehensive Plan policy. A legal notice regarding the Zoning Ordinance and Comprehensive Plan amendments associated with the revised noise contours, along with a "frequently asked questions"-type brochure describing basic airport noise concepts and terms as well as the proposed policy and regulatory changes, was mailed to over 2,000 property owners in the area near Dulles Airport. While it is recognized that the scope of this effort differed from the scope of EQAC's proposed public education effort (the focus was on noise contours and noise compatible planning and not airport operational procedures and noise complaints), there was minimal public interest in these matters based on the relative lack of inquiries received in response to the mailings. There are currently no plans for a broad outreach/educational effort at this time.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

Pursuit of EQAC's recommended educational efforts would be desirable but would need to be considered in terms of overall resources available for this and other demands on staff resources. It will not be possible to develop a public information campaign in a time frame that would result in dissemination of this information in advance of the end of the public comment period for the proposed construction of new runways at Dulles Airport (i.e., the "new construction" referenced in EQAC's recommendation), and flight frequencies at Dulles Airport will be driven more by market conditions than by anything else, although it is recognized that an increased capacity at the airport would allow for increased operations at capacity. As such, it is staff's view that any public education efforts that are pursued should focus on basic airport noise issues, conditions, and projections, along with links to related resources and to the Metropolitan Washington Airport Authority's information and complaint lines, rather than operational changes.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

An extensive education campaign is not recommended at this time. However, it would be appropriate to incorporate basic airport noise information onto the County's Web site, with links provided to the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority Web site and other related sites.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2006? If so, please explain.

Any efforts to develop public information, whether they are related to the addition of information to the County's Web site or to a broader educational campaign, will have resource implications and will need to be staffed within the context of other staff demands. However, staff is not recommending any additional funding for this effort at this time. Staff instead recommends coordination among applicable agencies to identify appropriate additions to the County's Web site

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

No long term implications are anticipated.

Response to 2004 EQAC Recommendation

Noise #3

(Page 237 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

Support the addition of new runways at Washington Dulles International Airport as long as aircraft operations at the airport associated with this increased operational capacity do not result in overall net increases in noise exposures to residents of Fairfax County when compared with operations that would occur using existing runways.

Lead agencies for this response: DPZ

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: None

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Noel Kaplan

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for proposed new runways at Washington Dulles International Airport was released in January, 2005; staff reviewed this document and focused its review on a broad range of environmental issues, with a primary focus on noise impacts to residential areas. Staff prepared an extensive set of comments for transmittal to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) along with a letter expressing support for the construction of new runways, with the recognition that further coordination and clarification was needed regarding noise and other environmental impacts associated with the proposed airport expansion. On March 7, 2005, the Board of Supervisors endorsed the staff comments and letter, and the materials were transmitted to FAA that day.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

This recommendation has been addressed. Staff has suggested, in its comments to FAA, the need for further coordination and clarification regarding a number of issues. It is likely that these issues will be discussed in the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS), and staff will review this document once it is issued (anticipated later in 2005). Staff will also welcome any coordination that FAA offers prior to or subsequent to the release of the FEIS.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

Staff will review the Final Environmental Impact Statement once it is released and pursue any opportunities for additional coordination that are provided by FAA and/or the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2006? If so, please explain.

No.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

No.

Response to 2004 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Noise #4

(Page 237 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

Encourage the use of opportunities provided by the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) that allow for third party contributions to noise barrier construction when the VDOT cost criteria preclude VDOT's construction of such barriers. Through this VDOT policy, neighborhoods affected by high levels of highway noise can participate in the funding of barriers that would not otherwise be constructed.

Lead agencies for this response: VDOT

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: DOT

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Lloyd Arnold

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

VDOT adopted a Noise Abatement Policy based upon Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) regulations. The State Noise Abatement Policy (SNAP) provides opportunity for third party funding when the cost of a noise abatement measure exceeds VDOT's cost effectiveness ceiling but the measure otherwise satisfies the criteria contained in this policy. VDOT advises noise impacted property-owners of the SNAP through correspondence and through its external website.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

Fairfax County should continue to use its proffer authority with developers to provide noise abatement measures and/or funding mechanisms to provide noise abatement measures consistent with VDOT noise abatement specifications. Fairfax County should also continue to coordinate with VDOT to determine where sound walls are already planned as part of a VDOT road construction project, which may offset abatement costs for the developer and/or VDOT. VDOT should continue to advise noise-impacted property owners of the SNAP including its third party funding option.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2006? If so, please explain.

No budget implications are anticipated in FY 2006 based on the projects expected to be constructed by Fairfax County or by VDOT within the County in FY 2006.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

With or without the EQAQ recommendation, the availability of the third party financing mechanism has potential longer-range fiscal implications to the County for those projects which the County or VDOT funds for which the State Noise Abatement Policy is applicable. This is due to the fact that noise barriers which exceed VDOT's cost-effectiveness ceiling would not be constructed at all, i.e., there would be no cost to a project, if the third party financing option were not provided. In the case of third party financing, the project pays the base amount per receptor for the noise wall up to VDOT's cost-effectiveness ceiling with the third party financing the rest.

Response to 2004 EQAC Recommendation

Noise #5

(Pages 237-238 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

Encourage the retention and planting of noninvasive vegetation to provide visual shielding of residents from highways. Where possible, support the provision of vegetated areas adjacent to highways that are wide enough and dense enough to provide noise reduction benefits to residential areas near the highways. Where feasible and appropriate, pursue such approaches in lieu of noise walls.

Lead agencies for this response: DPZ

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: DOT

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Noel Kaplan

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

Fairfax County's Policy Plan recommends mitigation for highway noise impacts that are projected to exceed DNL 65 dBA in residential areas. For exterior noise mitigation, noise barriers are needed where outdoor recreational areas will be subject to these noise levels. While it would be ideal to locate new residential developments far enough from highways such that setbacks alone will provide for acceptable noise levels, the combination of land scarcity, high land costs, and extent of noise impacts along many of the County's roadways causes this idea to be impractical as a general rule.

The County's highway noise policy is implemented on a site-by-site basis during the zoning process. There are no County Code requirements for highway noise mitigation measures; rather, commitments to such measures are negotiated during reviews of residential rezoning applications (and, where applicable, special exception applications for residential cluster developments). Tree preservation and planting efforts are encouraged during the zoning process, and it is certainly desirable to retain existing vegetation along highways where practicable and to plant trees where preservation is impractical or where tree cover does not already exist; however, narrow bands of trees are ineffective as noise barriers and only provide psychological benefit. For a vegetated area to have a significant impact on noise, it must be dense enough so that it cannot be seen through and wide enough to provide a significant benefit. The Federal Highway Administration's Web site, for example, states that a 200-foot width of dense vegetation can provide a 10 decibel reduction in noise but notes that "it is often impractical to plant enough vegetation along a road to achieve such reductions."

Noise Pollution #5

Continued

That being said, staff agrees with EQAC's recommendation to preserve and plant trees where possible adjacent to highways, generally in addition to, rather than instead of, more traditional structural barriers (either berms, walls, or combinations thereof). In staff's experience during the zoning process, the need for structural noise barriers in conjunction with residential development proposals near highways is nearly universal. Staff typically seeks, however, approaches to noise mitigation that are consistent with tree preservation and planting and feels that the planting and replacement of tree cover along either side of a structural barrier is appropriate.

The Fairfax County Department of Transportation participates in the design review of major VDOT projects in Fairfax County and generally supports preservation and planting efforts where appropriate, and when these efforts are consistent with VDOT design requirements.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

Staff concurs with the idea of maximizing tree preservation and/or planting near highways (and tree preservation and planting in general) but feels that the idea of establishing tree preservation/planting areas in lieu of structural noise barriers is generally impractical in Fairfax County. That being said, we agree that preservation and planting efforts are appropriate and that such efforts should be pursued where possible to provide aesthetic, psychological, and other environmental benefits in conjunction with the provision of structural measures.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

Staff should continue to be sensitive to this issue during the zoning process and negotiate commitments for tree preservation and planting efforts to the extent possible in areas near highways. In addition, where consistent with tree preservation goals and where sufficient land is available, staff should encourage the use of landscaped berms and berm/wall combinations in order to minimize the adverse aesthetic impacts of noise barriers.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2006? If so, please explain.

There are no budget implications for FY 2006

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

There are no long-term budget implications.

Response to 2004 EQAC Recommendation

Noise #6

(Page 238 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

Review all airport and highway studies that require Environmental Assessments or Environmental Impact Statements under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) for consistency with county policies addressing transportation-related noise and mitigation.

Lead agencies for this response: DPZ

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: DOT

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Noel Kaplan

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

This recommendation is being addressed as NEPA documentation is issued. As noted in the response to Noise recommendation #3, staff has completed its review of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for proposed new runways at Washington Dulles International Airport. As Environmental Impact Statements and Environmental Assessments are issued for other airport-related projects and highway projects, staff will review and comment on these documents and include noise-related considerations in its reviews.

It should be noted that county policies related to transportation-generated noise focus both on the need for noise compatible land use decisions near existing and projected sources of noise as well as on the minimization of adverse environmental impacts associated with new transportation facilities and services. In evaluating land use proposals for consistency with airport and highway noise policy, the 24-hour average “DNL” metric is applied, consistent with general federal interagency guidance on transportation noise compatibility (e.g., for residential development near highways, the focus is on reduction of exterior noise impacts in outdoor recreational areas to DNL 65 dBA or less). However, the Federal Highway Administration and VDOT have more specific peak hour noise criteria for evaluating impacts of new highway projects and in designing noise barriers, and NEPA documentation for highway projects apply these guidelines in their analyses. County staff reviews noise issues within this context for highway projects that are subject to the NEPA process.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

Staff concurs with this recommendation and is addressing it on a continuing basis as NEPA-related documents are issued.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

Staff recommends that reviews of NEPA documents for highway and airport-related projects continue as noted above.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2006? If so, please explain.

While staff resources are applied to the review of NEPA-related documents, these reviews are occurring, and will continue to occur, through the use of existing staff resources; no additional funding is needed.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

No.

Response to 2004 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Light Pollution #1a

(Page 249 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC recommends that the Board of Supervisors ensure that the Fairfax County Park Authority (FCPA) and the Fairfax County Public Schools (FCPS) fully comply with the new Ordinance and consistently follow the recommendations of the Illuminating Engineering Society of North America. EQAC further strongly recommends that the Board of Supervisors appoint a task force to determine appropriate standards and technology for lighting of athletic fields countywide.

Lead agencies for this response: FCPA and FCPS

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: None

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Dean Tistadt

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

This recommendation has already been addressed; Fairfax County Public Schools (FCPS) is compliant with the new light pollution Ordinance. Since the Ordinance was implemented in June 2003, FCPS has included it in the design guides and currently utilizes the recommendations of the Illuminating Engineers Society of North America (IESNA) in the design standards for all bond related projects. In addition, as lighting fixtures are replaced for maintenance purposes, FCPS is implementing the new standards and changing the fixtures to ensure we are compliant with the lighting standards.

Most of the parking lot lighting projects completed on school renovations and new buildings included in the 1995 and subsequent bonds meet the current outdoor lighting Ordinance. However, most building mounted lighting completed prior to June 2003 does not meet the current Ordinance. These fixtures will be upgraded to meet the new guidelines through natural attrition, as outlined in the Ordinance.

FCPS is willing to participate on a task force with the Fairfax County Park Authority to review and evaluate standards and technology for lighting of athletic fields countywide. However, current FCPS lighting standards are performing well and are in compliance with all local code requirements.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

This recommendation has been addressed.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

FCPS will continue to ensure that all new lighting projects are planned and completed in accordance with the Ordinance and recommendations of the Illuminating Engineering Society of North America.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2006? If so, please explain.

We do not believe this recommendation has any FY 2006 budget implications because we are already in compliance with the regulations.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

We do not believe this recommendation has any longer-range fiscal implications.

Response to 2004 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Light Pollution #1b

(Page 249 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC recommends that the Board of Supervisors ensure that the Fairfax County Park Authority (FCPA) and the Fairfax County Public Schools (FCPS) fully comply with the new Ordinance and consistently follow the recommendations of the Illuminating Engineering Society of North America. EQAC further strongly recommends that the Board of Supervisors appoint a task force to determine appropriate standards and technology for lighting of athletic fields countywide.

Lead agencies for this response: FCPA, FCPS

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: None

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Heather Melchior, 703 324-8559

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

Fairfax County Park Authority ensures that all new and replacement lighting is in compliance with the new Ordinance as well as the recommendations of the Illuminating Engineering Society of North America.

Fairfax County Park Authority understands the need to develop and maintain standards for lighting public facilities. Light pollution continues to be a serious concern as facilities are developed within Fairfax County's parks. Currently, the Park Authority ensures compliance with the Lighting Ordinance approved by the Board of Supervisors.

The Park Authority has contracted with a technical lighting consultant to prepare a report recommending specific products and applications for recreation lighting that are efficient and compatible with community needs. The analyses of the study will be used for future lighting specifications, purchases, and management. The Park Authority will continue to provide the most effective and efficient lighting equipment that meets or exceeds current regulations and minimizes, to the extent practicable, impact to adjacent residences. These practices ensure that appropriate facilities are constructed and operated. These actions should meet the community request that careful planning of recreation illumination is an important consideration in the quality of the environment.

The Park Authority believes it can best plan for recreation illumination needs and that a new task force would be redundant to ongoing efforts.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

The Park Authority will continue to ensure that all new lighting projects are carried out in accordance with the Ordinance and recommendations of the Illuminating Engineering Society of North America.

Furthermore, the Park Authority will continue to study the issue of lighting technology in order to provide lighting for outdoor events while minimizing the impact of lighting on surrounding uses.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2006? If so, please explain.

Because the Park Authority has been complying with these regulations already, there are no implications for the FY 2005 budget.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

We do not believe this recommendation has any longer-range fiscal implications.

Response to 2004 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Light Pollution #2A

(Item VIII-2 LIGHT POLLUTION – Page 249)

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC recommends that the Board of Supervisors direct that all exterior lighting fixtures installed on Fairfax County facilities and properties be consistent with the new Ordinance and follow the recommendations of the Illuminating Engineering Society of North America.

[Note: The “new Ordinance” refers to the recently adopted revisions to the outdoor lighting standards of the County’s Zoning Ordinance.]

Lead agency for this response: DPWES

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: DPZ

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Carey Needham, Chief, Building Design Branch, Planning and Design Division (Telephone No. 703-324-58163)

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

All new exterior lighting fixtures installed on Fairfax County facilities and properties are required to and will adhere to the recently adopted outdoor lighting standards of the County’s Zoning Ordinance, i.e. “the Ordinance”, and will follow the recommendations of the Illumination Engineering Society of North America (IESNA). This requirement will be applicable to all new Fairfax County facilities, renovations/modifications to existing County facilities that include changes to the exterior site lighting, and/or new improvements located on Fairfax County properties.

The retrofitting of the 500 to 600 older exterior lighting fixtures located at existing County facilities and properties to meet the current outdoor lighting requirements of the Ordinance is not being pursued at this time. Approximately \$750,000 to \$900,000 would be required to convert all the existing exterior lights located at County Facilities and properties to cutoff fixtures. Each of these existing lighting fixtures would need to be removed and replaced with a new fixture to provide cutoff lighting at these locations. In addition, the intensity of some of these exterior lights must be increased to a higher wattage in order to meet current lighting standards.

At the present time there are no funds available for the initial conversion of these existing exterior lights or the additional annual operation and maintenance costs for the increased intensity required. As previously stated, these existing exterior lights will be upgraded, as funds are made available, to current standards as existing facilities are modified or renovated through Capital Facilities projects in the future.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

We concur with the recommendation to adhere to the requirements of the “Ordinance” and IESNA recommendations for exterior lighting installed on Fairfax County facilities and properties. Existing lights that do not meet the current Ordinance outdoor lighting standards will be replaced with compliant fixtures as facilities are modified or renovated.

See above.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC’s recommendation?

Existing lights that do not meet the current Ordinance outdoor lighting standards will be replaced with compliant fixtures as facilities are modified or renovated.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2006? If so, please explain.

Funds are not currently available or proposed for consideration in FY 2006 to immediately replace older lighting fixtures.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

Yes – Future cost for light replacements and increased operation and maintenance payments – see above.

Response to 2004 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Light Pollution #2B

(Item VIII-2 LIGHT POLLUTION – Page 249)

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC further recommends that the Board of Supervisors direct that all older lighting fixtures under County control that do not meet the above standards be replaced on a phased basis with the newer recommended fixtures. EQAC notes that these steps will lead to significantly lower energy costs that will recoup the costs of the changeover within a reasonable period of time.

[Note: The “above standards” reference alludes to Recommendation 2A, which reads as follows: EQAC recommends that the Board of Supervisors direct that all exterior lighting fixtures installed on Fairfax County facilities and properties be consistent with the new Ordinance and follow the recommendations of the Illuminating Engineering Society of North America. The “new Ordinance” refers to the recently adopted revisions to the outdoor lighting standards of the County’s Zoning Ordinance.]

Lead agency for this response: DPWES

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: DPZ

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Felix M. Bermejo, Team Leader, Streetlight Engineering Team, Planning and Design Division (Telephone No. 703-324-5814)

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

The issue of retrofitting older streetlights (semi-cutoffs) by installing cutoff fixtures to reduce light pollution was included in the package presented to the Board of Supervisors (BOS) on January 24, 2000. The BOS concurred that new cobra head streetlights shall utilize cutoff fixtures. In addition, it was recognized that funding was not available to replace older existing streetlight fixtures. However, as older cobra head fixtures are taken out of service they will be replaced with cutoff fixtures. Currently, of the approximately 52,589 streetlights incorporated in the Fairfax County Streetlight Program, there are approximately 38,000 semi-cutoff cobra head fixtures in operation. Approximately 27,000 of these streetlights utilize the older mercury vapor (MV) light source with the remaining 11,000 streetlights utilizing a high-pressure sodium vapor light source. In many cases, these older MV non-cutoff cobra head streetlights may not meet current roadway lighting standards. As older MV light sources reach the end of their useful service life they will be replaced with a high-pressure sodium vapor light source.

It is estimated that an order of magnitude of \$6 million to \$7 million would be required to immediately convert all the existing 38,000 semi-cutoff cobra head fixtures to cutoff fixtures. Each of these existing lighting fixtures would have to be removed and replaced with a new fixture to provide cutoff lighting at these locations. In addition, the intensity of the majority of these streetlights, in particular the streetlights that currently utilize a MV light source, must be

Light Pollution #2B

Continued

increased to a higher wattage in order to meet current lighting standards. It is estimated that this increase in streetlight intensity will result in a \$350,000 increase to the annual operation and maintenance costs for street lighting.

At the present time there are no funds available for the initial conversion of the existing streetlights or the additional annual operation and maintenance costs for the increased intensity required.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

We generally concur with the recommendation to replace older lighting fixtures –
See above.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

Steps will be taken as described above.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2006? If so, please explain.

Funds are not currently available or proposed for consideration in FY 2006 to immediately replace the older light fixtures.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

Yes – Future cost for light replacements and increased operation and maintenance payments.

Response to 2004 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Light Pollution #3

(Page 249 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC recommends that the Board of Supervisors work with VDOT and Virginia elected officials to eliminate unnecessary roadway lighting and to achieve replacement of existing poorly designed fixtures (under the control of VDOT) on our roadways with the same type of fixtures specified in Recommendation 2 above. Note: Recommendation 2 states all exterior lighting fixtures follow the recommendations of the Illuminating Society of North America; additionally, all older lighting fixtures that do not meet these standards be replaced on a phased basis with the newer recommended fixtures.

Lead agencies for this response: VDOT

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: None

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Gottfried A. Kofi

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

All new future roadway projects for the roadway lighting will use the same type of fixtures specified in Recommendation #2.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2006? If so, please explain.

It is not feasible to replace all existing old fixtures with new fixtures as specified in recommendation #2. The total cost to replace all fixtures is about 2-3 million and there is no funding for this purpose. However, it is our intention to replace the old fixture with a new fixture on an as needed basis; if the old fixture requires replacement, a new fixture that meets the specification in recommendation 2 will be installed.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

Response to 2004 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Light Pollution #4

(Page 249 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC recommends that the Board of Supervisors continue to monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of the recently enacted Outdoor Lighting Ordinance to determine any areas in which enhancements and modifications may be needed and to ensure that lighting standards and practices and the reduction of light pollution in Fairfax County are comprehensively addressed.

Lead agencies for this response: DPZ

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: None

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Lorrie Kirst

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

The new Zoning Ordinance outdoor lighting standards became effective on June 17, 2003. County staff continues to monitor the effectiveness of the new standards and have found that the new regulations are yielding positive results with respect to glare control and in minimizing excessive light levels in certain commercial development. Staff's current monitoring activities include the observation of projects built pursuant to the new standards, discussions with individuals who are in the process of preparing plans pursuant to the new standards, citizen comments, and the number and type of outdoor lighting complaints received by the Zoning Enforcement Branch.

It is recommended that staff's current monitoring activities continue and that adjustments to the outdoor lighting standards be considered as new information becomes known and additional projects are approved and built under the current standards. Monitoring activities should include periodic review of the recommendations and standards that are provided by the Illuminating Engineering Society of North America (IESNA). This organization provides standards that are recognized and observed by most lighting professionals. It is also recommended that a comprehensive review of the County's outdoor lighting standards' effectiveness be conducted within the next two years. Interim adjustments could be proposed if it should become apparent that certain provisions require more timely revision.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

Light Pollution #4

Continued

Not Applicable

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

See Above

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2006? If so, please explain.

No.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

There could be some possible longer range fiscal implications if the current lighting standards are amended and if the adopted changes would require additional staff resources and/or equipment.

Response to 2004 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Light Pollution #5

(Page 250 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC recommends that the Board of Supervisors support county staff efforts to develop any additional technical information that may be needed for the education of architects, contractors, electricians, and builders as to what the county permits and does not permit in the field of illumination and the technology available for compliant installations.

Lead agencies for this response: DPZ

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: DPWES (Planning and Design); OPA

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Lorrie Kirst

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

In September of 2003, staff published and distributed a 16 page booklet that provides a summary of the County's outdoor lighting standards. Although the booklet contains some technical information, it was designed for use primarily by homeowners, County staff and building industry professionals that are looking for guidance on meeting the current County outdoor lighting regulations. The booklet is available on the Department of Planning and Zoning's website. If any revisions to the outdoor lighting standards are adopted in the future, the 2003 booklet will be revised as necessary to reflect such changes. At this time, there appears to be no immediate need to develop additional technical information to supplement the 2003 booklet. .

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

Staff is generally in agreement with the recommendation. The outdoor lighting standards were comprehensively changed in 2003 and it was anticipated that there would be a period of adjustment for those designing and installing lighting as well as for County staff that are responsible for site inspections and plan review. Although it appears that lighting professionals and staff are effectively adjusting to the new outdoor lighting regulations, it is believed that the development of information to provide guidance on the selection of compliant lighting fixtures and how lighting can be applied in efficient and effective ways could be beneficial. However, such actions would require staff resources, thereby reducing available resources for other activities.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

Staff should continue to monitor the effectiveness of the new outdoor lighting standards and to update the 2003 booklet if any changes to the outdoor lighting standards are adopted in the future.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2006? If so, please explain.

No.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

No.

Response to 2004 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Visual Pollution #1

(Pages 254-257 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

EQAC strongly recommends that the lack of an explicit provision in Article 12-300 of the present Ordinance for assessment of civil penalties be rectified at the earliest opportunity. It is recommended that Article 18-903 of the Ordinance be amended by deleting items 1.H and 1.I.. These provisions should be replaced by new, more comprehensive, language added to Article 12 as follows:

PART 4 12-400 VIOLATIONS, INFRACTIONS, AND PENALTIES

12-401 General provisions

1. Any sign erected, placed, or affixed contrary to any of the provisions of this Article or contrary to any provisions of any permit issued under this Article shall be and is hereby declared to be unlawful.
2. Any person (whether owner, officer, lessee, principal, agent, employee or otherwise), corporation, or organization who violates any of the provisions of this Article, or permits such violation, or fails to comply with any of the requirements hereof shall be subject to the enforcement provisions of this Part.
3. Upon becoming aware of any violation of any provision of this Article, the Zoning Administrator shall serve notice of such violation on the person committing or permitting the same, which notice shall require the violation to cease within such reasonable time as is specified in the notice. After such notice is sent and such violation is not ceased within such reasonable time as is specified in the notice, then the Zoning Administrator may proceed to remedy the violation as provided in Sections 402 or 403 below. The Zoning Administrator may also revoke a residential or non-residential use permit to terminate the violation. Any written notice of the Zoning Administrator shall include a statement informing the recipient that a right to appeal the notice of a zoning violation or a written order within thirty days may exist in accordance with Sect. 15.2-2311 of the Code of Virginia and Part 3 of Article 18 of the Zoning Ordinance, and that the decision shall be final and unappealable if not appealed within thirty days. The appeal period shall not commence until such statement is given.

4. In addition to the remedies provided in Par. 3 above, the Zoning Administrator may initiate injunction, mandamus, or any other appropriate action to prevent, enjoin, abate, or remove such erection, placement, or affixation in violation of any provision of this Article. Such action may also be instituted by any citizen who may be aggrieved or particularly damaged by any violation of any provisions of this Article.

12-402 Infractions and Civil Penalties

1. A violation of the provisions of this Article shall be deemed an infraction and shall be punishable by a civil penalty of \$100 for the first violation at a specific location; any subsequent violations at the same location arising from the same set of operative facts shall be punishable by a civil penalty of \$250 for each separate offense, except that any violation arising from the same set of operative facts at the same location which persists for sixty (60) days or more may, at the discretion of the Zoning Administrator, thereafter be treated as a criminal misdemeanor.

2. Each day during which any violation of the provisions of this Article is found to have existed at the same location shall constitute a separate offense. However, in no event shall any such violation arising from the same set of operative facts at the same location be charged more frequently than once in any ten day period, nor shall a series of such violations arising from the same set of operative facts at the same location result in civil penalties which exceed a total of \$5000.

3. The designation of a particular violation of this Article at a particular location as an infraction pursuant to Par. 1 above shall be in lieu of criminal sanctions, and except for any violation resulting in injury to any person or persons, or any violation arising from the same set of operative facts at the same location persisting for more than sixty (60) days, such designation shall preclude the prosecution of a violation as a criminal misdemeanor.

4. After having served a notice of violation on any person committing or permitting a violation of the Zoning Ordinance provisions enumerated in this Article and if such violation has not ceased within such reasonable time as is specified in such notice, then, upon the approval of the County Attorney, the Zoning Administrator shall cause two (2) copies of a summons to be served upon such person.

5. Such summons shall contain the following information:

- A. The name and address of the person, corporation or organization charged.
 - B. The nature of the infraction and the Ordinance provision(s) being violated.
 - C. The location, date, and time that the infraction occurred or was observed.
 - D. The amount of the civil penalty assessed for the infraction.
- The manner, location, and time in which the civil penalty may be paid to the County.
 - The right of the recipient of the summons to elect to stand trial for the infraction and the date for such trial.
6. The summons shall provide that any person, corporation, or organization summoned for a violation may elect to pay the civil penalty by making an appearance in person or in writing by mail to the Department of Finance at least seventy-two (72) hours prior to the time and date fixed for the trial and, by such appearance, may enter a waiver of trial, admit liability, and pay the civil penalty established for the offense charged. Such summons shall provide that the signature to an admission of liability shall have the same force and effect as a judgment of court, however, an admission shall not be deemed a criminal conviction for any purpose.
7. If a person, corporation, or organization charged with a violation does not elect to enter a waiver of trial and admit liability, the violation shall be tried in the General District Court in the same manner and with the same right of appeal as provided by law. A finding of liability shall not be deemed a criminal conviction for any purpose.
8. The remedies provided for in this section are cumulative and not exclusive and shall be in addition to any other remedies provided by law.

12-403 Criminal Violations and Penalties

1. Any violation of the provisions of this Article, other than those set forth in Sect 12-402 above, shall be deemed a misdemeanor and, upon conviction thereof, shall be punishable by a fine of not less than \$100 and not more than \$1000. Failure to remove or abate a violation within the

time period established by the Court shall constitute a separate misdemeanor offense punishable by a fine of not less than \$100 and not more than \$1000, and any such failure during any succeeding ten day period shall constitute a separate misdemeanor offense for each ten day period punishable by a fine of not less than \$100 and not more than \$1000.

Lead agencies for this response: DPZ

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: Sheriff's Office; OPA;VDOT; County Attorney

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Michael Congleton

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

The recommendation proposes the amendment of Article 12 of the Fairfax County Zoning Ordinance to include a civil penalty provision for sign violations, with an option to pursue such violations as a criminal misdemeanor if repeat offenses occur. Va. Code Ann. § 15.2-2209 (LNMB 2003) allows any locality to “adopt an ordinance which establishes a uniform schedule of civil penalties for violations of specified provisions of the zoning ordinance.” Zoning Ordinance § 18-903 (1) (H) has already designated violations of Zoning Ordinance §§ 12-104(1), (4), (5), (6), (7), (11), (12), (13), or (14) relating to the erection of prohibited signs on private property are as punishable by a civil penalty of \$100 for the first violation; any subsequent violation is punishable by a civil penalty of \$250, with total fines of not more than \$5,000. These fine amounts are identical to those proposed in the EQAC recommendation. The Zoning Administrator also has the option of enforcing the Zoning Ordinance by requesting injunctive relief in the Circuit Court. Moreover, Va. Code Ann. § 15.2-2209 also specifically provides that “[d]esignation of a specific zoning violation for a civil penalty . . . *shall be in lieu of criminal sanctions*, except for a violation resulting in injury to persons,” and precludes prosecution of that specified violation as a misdemeanor in a criminal case. (Emphasis added.) Consequently, Zoning Ordinance § 18-903(3) provides that any designation of a zoning violation punishable by a civil penalty shall be in lieu of criminal sanctions except for a violation resulting in injury to persons and therefore cannot be prosecuted as a misdemeanor. Therefore, the recommendation of EQAC proposing civil penalties for sign violations with the option to pursue repeat violations as misdemeanors is prohibited by Va. Code Ann. § 15.2-2209. An amendment to Va. Code Ann. § 15.2-2209 would be required to authorize any such enforcement approach, as well as amendments to the Zoning Ordinance.

However, EQAC should be aware that the Board of Supervisors is considering entering into an agreement with the Commonwealth Transportation Commissioner pursuant to Va. Code Ann. § 33.1-375.1 (LNMB Supp, 2004), which would permit the County to enforce the provisions of Va. Code Ann. § 33.1-373, which prohibits advertising in the public rights-of-way, as EQAC recommended in Recommendation: Visual Pollution #2. Va. Code Ann. § 33.1-373 provides for a civil penalty of \$100 for each violation of that section and for injunctive relief for recurring violations.

Visual Pollution #1

Continued

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

This recommendation has not been considered by the Board of Supervisors.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

This recommendation should be forwarded to the Board of Supervisors for their consideration.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2006? If so, please explain.

N/A

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

N/A

Response to 2004 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Visual Pollution #2

(Page 257-258 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

The Fairfax County Sign Task Force made several recommendations. EQAC strongly urges the Board of Supervisors to again consider the Task Force's report and either implement its findings or reconstitute the Task Force to find alternatives that are more palatable to the Board and citizens of the County.

- ❖ After holding a public hearing, the Board, pursuant to Virginia Code §33.1-375, should enter into an Agreement with the Commissioner of VDOT to enforce Virginia Code § 33.1-373. The Agreement would provide for sharing civil penalties collected after the County's costs have been recovered. [The Task Force provided a draft Agreement for the Board to consider.]
- ❖ The County should fully support the County Sheriff's program of using inmates for removal of roadside litter, including removal of signs illegally posted in a right-of-way.
- ❖ The County should implement a pilot project of approximately six months to determine whether additional resources are needed, and if so, develop a list of alternatives for further evaluation and ranking in terms of cost benefit analysis for the Board to use as it decides whether to expand the Agreement or move in a different direction.
- ❖ The County should conduct an information and public outreach program regarding restrictions of signs in the public rights-of-way and any new County program to prosecute sign violations.
- ❖ The County Executive should send letters to public entities within the County advising them of illegal signs and outcomes of posting same.
- ❖ The Board should invite VDOT to consider implementing in Fairfax County additional possible deterrents to minimize illegal signs in the rights-of-way.
- ❖ As part of its Legislative Program, the Board should seek an amendment to the Code of Virginia that would declare all signs illegally posted in a right-of-way to be abandoned and, therefore, illicit trash that may be removed by anyone.

Visual Pollution #2

Continued

- ❖ If the above is not successful or possible, then the alternative is to seek an Amendment to the Code of Virginia that would permit individuals, as opposed to organized groups, to participate in the Adopt-A-Highway program to remove or cleanup illegal signs as duly authorized representatives of the Commissioner.
- ❖ The County should seek an Amendment to the Code of Virginia placing reasonable limitations on political campaign signs in the right-of-way. The County should offer recommendations for limits on the number, minimum distance between individual signs, and the time frame for posting and then removing the signs.

Lead agency for this response: DPZ

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: Sheriff's office, OPA, VDOT, the County Attorney's Office, and the Legislative Liaison

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Michael Congleton

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

As noted in last year's response, the General Assembly adopted an amendment to Va. Code Ann Section 33.1-375.1 (LNMB 2003) that was recommended by the Sign Task Force and provides authority for Fairfax County to enter into an agreement with the Commonwealth Transportation Commissioner to enforce Va. Code Ann. Section 33.1-373, which prohibits advertising within the limits of any highway. However, any enforcement agreement is subject to the provisions of § 33.1-375.1(C), which provide that political signs and special event signs may remain in the rights of-way for three days after an election or the special event, and that other signs and advertising may remain in the rights-of-way for no more than three days. The amendment became effective July 1, 2003. Prior to the implementation of any enforcement program, the Board of Supervisors is required to hold a public hearing on whether the Board should enter into such an agreement. Consequently, staff of the Zoning Enforcement Branch of the Department of Planning and Zoning is in the process of formulating a proposed approach for implementing an enforcement program should the Board decide to enter into such an agreement. It was anticipated that this work would have been completed during the past year. While progress has been made, it has been necessary to divert the staff resources responsible for this assignment to other pressing needs, principally to work on Zoning Ordinance amendments which have been given an extremely high priority by the Board, such as the Yard/Fence/Lot Width Modification amendment, the Casualty amendment, the Cluster amendment and the P District amendment. Additionally, the significant amount of time spent by the Zoning Administrator and management staff of the Zoning Enforcement Branch on such issues as work program changes, litigation efforts and responding to the numerous "hot button" issues that invariably arise in the zoning administration line of business, has impacted their ability to invest the quality time necessary on this item. It is anticipated however, that by the spring of 2005, appropriate staff resources can

Visual Pollution #2

Continued

again be devoted to this effort. To date, as part of the development of this program, staff contacted the staff of Prince William County, who recently implemented such a program. It is anticipated that other County agencies will be included in the design of the program, including the Office of the County Attorney, the Department of Public Works and Environmental Services, the Virginia Department of Transportation, and the Office of the Sheriff. Staff will also develop a campaign to publicize the program and educate/inform the community and public agencies of the regulations and the enforcement effort. At the end of the first year of the program the County will review the results of the program and make a determination if additional resources are required and consider possible retention, modification and/or expansion of the program.

The Office of the Sheriff has offered to assist the County in dealing with illegal signs on public rights of way in Fairfax County through the Community Labor Force (CLF) programs. The CLF programs provide an innovative alternative to incarceration and work release. Labor crews, consisting of well-screened offenders under the supervision of deputy sheriffs, provide necessary services to the County, such as graffiti removal, blight abatement, county wide litter pick-up, bus stop maintenance, and landscaping at public facilities. While the CLF program could become a cost effective tool in the implementation of the sign enforcement program, the Sheriff's Office has noted that given it's current initiatives, the CLF program will only be available to address sign removal in a limited capacity.

As to the recommendation regarding a legislative change to the Adopt-a-Highway programs to include individuals, a legislative change is not required because changes to the program are policy decisions of the Virginia Department of Transportation.

Regarding the recommendation for an amendment to the Code of Virginia, declaring all signs illegally posted to be considered illicit trash, such legislation was considered in 2004 and not recommended by the Board of Supervisors last year.

The General Assembly in its 2004 Session considered House Bill 804, which addressed issues related to the classification of political signs as advertising and limitations on the number, minimum distance, and time limits for these signs. This bill was sent to the Privileges and Elections Committee in December of 2004 and no further action has been taken.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

Not applicable.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

See above.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2006? If so, please explain.

Visual Pollution #2

Continued

This issue will be reviewed as part of the formulation of the proposed sign enforcement program should the County decide to enter into an agreement with the Commonwealth Transportation Commissioner. It is anticipated that if current staffing levels are not reduced, the proposed study can be accommodated within existing funding levels.

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

There may be potential long range fiscal implications if the Board enters into an agreement with the Commonwealth Transportation Commissioner and the sign enforcement program is successful and implemented on a Countywide basis, requiring additional staff resources.

Response to 2004 EQAC Recommendation

Recommendation: Visual Pollution #3

(Page 258 of the Annual Report on the Environment)

EQAC Recommendation:

The Environmental Quality Advisory Council supports the general premise underpinning each of the Task Force's recommendations above [Visual Pollution recommendation #2], but believes that before the County seeks major amendments to the Code or introduces new programs of its own, a study should be performed to determine the impact on existing programs, staffing, and budget, and that a cost benefit analysis determine the extent to which the proposed amendments or additions would contribute to reducing visual pollution in a cost effective manner, having due regard for the possibilities of cost recovery through the rigorous imposition of civil penalties.

Lead agency for this response: DPZ

Coordinating agency(ies) for this response: *(coordination needed with the Sheriff's office, OPA, VDOT, and the County Attorney's Office)*

Please identify a lead agency contact person: Michael Congleton

Has this recommendation already been addressed, or is it in the process of being addressed? If so, please provide details.

As part of the development of this sign enforcement program staff will identify the impacts on existing programs, staffing and budgetary considerations which will be presented to the Board of Supervisors. A cost benefit analysis for a sign removal program may be conducted upon the conclusion of the first year of the program.

If this recommendation has not been (or is not being) addressed, do you concur with the recommendation? Why or why not?

Not applicable.

What, if any, actions should be taken pursuant to EQAC's recommendation?

See above.

Do the actions recommended above have any budget implications for FY 2006? If so, please explain.

N/A

Visual Pollution #3

Continued

Do the actions recommended above have any longer-range fiscal implications? If so, please explain.

The Sheriff's Office is currently involved in numerous projects to address visual pollution. Assuming additional responsibilities associated with the code enforcement of illegal signs addressed in the Annual report would require additional staffing and funding.